N° 46
Rec'd: Feb'y 21.'49
Rev P Rafferty
Pa

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

BX 1795
Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....
Shelf .R15.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE,

PROVED

FROM

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

BY

REV. P. RAFFERTY.

Vigilate, state in fide.

Watch ye; stand fast in the faith.—1 Cor. xvi. 13.

Without faith it is impossible to please God.—Heb. xi. 6.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY HENRY McGRATH,
No. 1 South Eighth Street.
1849.

BX1751
.R15

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

Entered, according to act of Congress, in the year 1849, by
REV. P. RAFFERTY,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

King & Baird, Printers, No. 9 George street.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	How to Find the True Church of Christ, - - - - - -	9
II.	The Nature of Heresy and Schism,	20
III.	Unity of the Church, - - -	30
IV.	Communion with See of Peter the Centre of Unity, - - - -	38
V.	Change of Religion in England was made without the free consent of the Clergy, - - - - -	49
VI.	Of Infallibility, - - - - -	65
VII.	Arguments against the Protestant rul of Faith and judge of controversies, - - - - -	72
VIII.	Apostolical Traditions, - - -	85
IX.	Apostolical Succession, - -	92
X.	Catholic rule of Faith and judge of controversies, - - - - -	107
XI.	Salvation only in the Catholic Church,	116
XII.	Holy Orders, - - - - -	138

XIII. The Single Life of Priests, - - 144
XIV. Of the Sacrifice of the Mass, - 150
XV. Transubstantiation, - - - 153
XVI. Communion in one kind, - - 163
XVII. Purgatory, - - - - - 169
XVIII. Penance, - - - - - 178
XIX. Holy Water, - - - - - 188
XX. Confirmation, - - - - 194
XXI. Baptism, - - - - - 197
XXII. Matrimony, - - - - 199
XXIII. Extreme Unction, - - - - 200
XXIV. Worship and Invocation of Angels and Saints, - - - - 201
XXV. Of Images, - - - - - 210
XXVI. Of the Relics of Saints and Pilgrimages to Holy places, - - 215
XXVII. Good Works, - - - - 221

PREFACE.

THERE are in the gospels the fullest and plainest promises of a perpetual infallibility made by Christ to his Church, as will appear from the following text, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi. 18. "I will ask my Father, and he will send you another comforter to abide with you for ever," John xiv. 16. "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things into your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," John xiv. "I have yet many things to say unto you: but you cannot bear them now. However, when the spirit of Truth is come, he will teach you all

truth," John xvi. 13. "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world," Matt. xxviii. 20. All which is confirmed by St. Paul, calling the church of Christ, "The pillar and ground of truth," 1 Tim. iii. 15. The motive, which sufficed to fix so great and learned a man as St. Augustin in the religion he had chosen, is surely no weak one, and may suffice to direct any man, whether learned or unlearned, in the choice he has to make. Let us then hear his own words. Lastly, (says he) "the very name of Catholic holds me, of which this church alone has not, without reason, so kept the possession, that though all heretics desire to he called Catholics, yet if a stranger asks them where Catholics meet, no heretic dare to point out his own house or church." But what church is it in which St. Augustin was held steadfast by the very name of Catholics? His words immediately preceding are a full answer to this question. "Thirdly, (says he) a succession of bishops

descending from the See of St. Peter, to whom Christ after his resurrection committed his flock, holds me in the church." Contra Epist. Fund. c. iv. It is plain then it was the church in communion with the See of Rome, St. Augustin had chosen for his guide. It was in this church he was held by the very name of Catholic, because she had always had, and has had ever since so full and undisputed a possession of this honourable title, that no communion separated from her was ever able either to gain it to itself or dispossess her of it.

But what means the word Catholic? It is a Greek word, and signifies the same as universal. And this is so essential a condition of the church, that no society upon earth can pretend to be a part of it, unless it be in the communion of that church, which has universality both of time and place. Of time, by being the standing church of all ages since the time of the apostles; and of place, by having on its side the agreement of people and na-

tions, according to St. Augustin's expression. Both which parts of the church's universality are clearly marked out in the word of God. Her universality of time marked out by Christ promising his apostles "that the gates of hell shall not prevail against," Matt. xvi. 18. And "that he will be with them always even unto the end of the world," xxviii. 20. And by Isaias, in these prophetic words: "This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever," Isaiah lix. 21.

Her universality of place, marked out first by God's promise to Abraham, that "all nations of the earth should be blessed in his seed," Gen. xxii. 18. 2dly, by the Psalmist, "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of

the earth for thy possession, Psalm ii. 8. And again, "Praise the Lord all ye nations, praise him all ye people," Psalm cxvi. 1. 3dly, by Isaias describing "the future glory of the church of Christ in the multitude of people and nations flocking to her," Isaiah lx. And lastly, by Christ himself giving a commission to the apostles and their successors to "go and teach all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19.

As to the church in communion with the See of Rome, she has not only had an uninterrupted visible being from the time of the apostles to this day, but has always been the most illustrious society of Christians upon earth. She has therefore the universality of time promised by Christ, and foretold by Isaias. She has likewise preached the gospel to the most remote nations in the world, who have all received the faith of Christ from her bishops and pastors.

There can be no true church but what has its origin from Christ and his apostles. And

this is likewise a truth, which cannot be contested. Now it is a plain historical fact, that the reformation began in 1517; and that there were none of the pretended reformed churches in the world before that time; because there could be no reformed churches before the reformation, which gave them their birth. I trust the following pages will, if read with proper dispositions, be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind that the Roman Catholic Church is, and ever will be, the only true church of Christ the pillar and ground of truth.

CHAPTER I.

HOW TO FIND THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The first rule is that of Tertullian, (de Præscript, c. 22.) "Quod apud multos unum invenitur, non est erratum, sed traditum. That which amongst many is found one, is no error, but handed down. In other words, tradition, time out of mind. And let any one dare, says he, affirm that they were in an error who begun this tradition."

The second rule for finding out apostolical traditions, is given by St. Augustin, (L. 2, Bapt. c. 7; L. 4, c. 23, and L. 5, c. 23,) which is this: "Whatever is found to have been held by the universal church over the whole world, and not to have had its beginning from any ordinance of bishops or councils, but to have been prior to any such ordinance, that is to be esteemed a tradition of those by whom the church was first established, that is, of the apostles of Christ." By this

rule this great doctor of the church proves against the Donatists, that baptism given by heretics ought not to be reiterated, because of the ancient custom of the church, which received their baptism; and by this very same rule, Catholics, with the highest degree of evidence, and the utmost force, maintain the doctrines and practices of the church, which modern sects have protested against, to be indeed apostolical traditions, by reason of the long possession they have obtained throughout all Christendom. A possession have not acquired any ordinances of councils, but have had before any such ordinances, and which they quietly enjoyed, long before it was contradicted by any man, which was certainly the case of sacrifice of mass, of prayers for the dead, of the invocation of saints, &c. These are all certainly apostolical traditions. Now the apostles delivered nothing but true doctrines, to be handed down from age to age.

The third rule is that of St. Irenæ, in his third book against heresies, chap. iv. And of Tertullian, in his book of prescriptions, chap. xxxii. and xxxvii. viz: That to discern what traditions are apostolical, and what not, we

must have recourse to the churches founded by the apostles, and learn from them what the apostles taught. For as by their testimony we know what scriptures are apostolical, and what not, so by their testimony we are to know what traditions are to be esteemed apostolical, which have been delivered as such by the churches founded by the apostles, amongst which the greatest and most ancient, according to Irenæus in the same place, is that of Rome, founded by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; to which church, by reason of its more powerful principality, "all must have recourse, and in which the apostolical tradition has always been preserved by those that are in every place." "A happy church," says Tertullian, chap. xxxvi., "its condition to which the apostles bequeathed their whole doctrine with their blood." This rule is certainly well-grounded; because, as our Lord by himself, and by his holy Spirit, certainly taught his apostles all truth, so his apostles, by his commission, certainly delivered all that he taught to the churches which they founded. So that these are certainly the best qualified to be witnesses of what the

apostles taught, which are the things we call apostolical traditions. By the application of this rule to our modern controversies, the first religion must certainly gain her cause against all sects; because, notorious to all the world, that when the present differences in religion first began, all apostolical churches, with one accord, received, held, and maintained those doctrines and practices for apostolical traditions, which are now rejected and impugned by the pretenders to reformation.

Against these rules our adversaries object, that all the churches founded by the apostles, and in a word, all Christendom, quickly forsook or corrupted the doctrine of the apostles, and went astray into error, superstition, and idolatry; and therefore there was a necessity for their reformation, which, if we will believe them, was nothing else but bringing back again the primitive doctrines which had possession of the church before she was corrupted with popery.

This impious pretence, upon which the whole reformation is grounded, is demonstratively confuted by all those texts of scripture which assure us that the church founded by

Christ should never be corrupted by damnable errors. It is also infinitely injurious to Christ, giving Satan so early a victory over his kingdom. Yet the reformers pretend that the whole church of God of the New Testament, "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendom, were at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices the most detested by God and damnable to man, and that for the space of eight hundred years and more." Hom. of peril of idolatry, part iii.

But for the more fully confuting this groundless system, which pretends that the primitive Christians were Protestants, till their successors introduced popery; and to demonstrate the perpetual succession of the Catholic doctrine from the apostles, I shall borrow the words of a modern writer upon this subject, which seem to me to put the matter out of dispute. "If the faithful in the first centuries were Protestants, when and how did their posterity become papists? (for papists they certainly were, when Luther undertook to reform the church's doctrine, anno 1517, and

had been so for many hundred years.) In what year of our Lord did this popery first creep into the church? Who was the first author of it? In what place was it first broached? What opposition did it meet with at its first appearance from the zeal of the pastors of the church? What disturbances did it cause? What books were written on this occasion, what councils held? &c. Or was this the only change in religion, the only heresy, which crept into the world without author, without date, without disturbance, without resistance; so that the whole world, by a strange revolution, from Protestant became papist, though no one knows how, nor when?

"We can trace up protestancy to the very year in which it was first broached, viz. 1517, we can name the day when their first preacher laid the foundations of their religions, (by his first sermon at Wittemburg against indulgences,) at which time we could have said to them with truth, your profession had no being yesterday. We can tell the author, the place, the first and chief abettors of their doctrine; the disturbances it caused; the resistance which it met with; the books written on both

sides, &c. We can do the same with regard to Arianism, and all other heresies or innovations in religion. Let them name the pope or bishop of Rome for these 1847 years that brought into the church a religion different from that in which his immediate predecessor both lived and died. Which, as they certainly cannot do, is a plain demonstration the faith of the church was never changed.

"I would here ask of these gentlemen, who would persuade us that Protestancy was the religion of the first ages, and that there was a time when the whole church was Protestant, whether these ancient Protestants, at the first appearance of popery, all unanimously agreed to embrace it; or whether a great part of them stuck out, and remained steady to their ancient faith? If a great part of them stuck out, and continued steady to the Protestant religion, what disputes did diversity of sentiments produce? What books were written for and against, as always happens on such occasions? If all at once were bewitched into an unanimous agreement in popery."

I know our adversaries will say that popery, as they call it, was not all brought into the

church at one time, but by degrees; that prayers for the dead were introduced in one century; invocation of saints in another, and so of the rest.

But this reply does not at all lessen the force of our argument; as may be easily made appear in the aforesaid instances of prayers for the dead, and invocation of saints. Prayers for the dead are laid aside in all the reformed churches, as vain and superstitious; though they cannot but acknowledge, that they were maintained and practised by the universal church. And Arius, as we learn from St. Epiphanius, Haer. 75, and St. Augustine, Her. 27, was in the fourth century ranked amongst the heretics, for presuming to say, that the prayers and alms of the living did the dead no good. Now, if there ever was a time when the primitive Christians were Protestants in this particular, so as to be convinced that prayers for the dead were vain and superstitious; if this, I say, was the notion of the Christians of the first and second century, how was it possible that their immediate successors in the third century, should so unanimously embrace this practice; should reckon

it amongst their most ancient traditions? (Tertullian de corona militis, c. 3.) "And the first man that offered to oppose it in the following age, should upon that account be condemned as an heretic; especially since our adversaries must acknowledge, that in the third and fourth century the church was well stocked with prelates, both learned and zealous against all novelties, that would never have sat still and tamely suffered the faith to be corrupted by any man."

In like manner as to the invocation of saints, which many Protestants accuse of downright idolatry; it is confessed by their best divines to have been the doctrine and practice of the fathers, at least in the fourth century and downwards. It is confessed, says Mr. Thorndike, in Epil. P. 3, p. 358, that the lights both of the Greek and Latin church, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory Nyssene, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Theodoret, St. Fulgentius, St. Gregory the Great, St. Leo, and all after that time, have held the invocation of saints, and desired their assistance.

Now if there ever was a time, in which the primitive Christians were protestant as to this article, and in which they believed as Protestants now do, that the invocation of saints was superstition and idolatry, how was it possible, that all on a sudden, the whole current of the fathers in those times of learning, zeal, and piety, should all run into this practice without resistance from any one, but such as were condemned heretics, Eunomeus, Vigilantius and Faustus?. Certainly these great lights of antiquity were better qualified to know what was the doctrine of their immediate predecessors, than modern Protestants at the distance of more than fourteen hundred years can pretend to be; and it is not less certain, that they were not capable of taking up any practice, if they had known that their forefathers abhorred it as superstition and idolatry. The like may be said with regard to all the other points of modern controversy, in which the adversaries of the church charge her with having altered and corrupted the ancient faith. And indeed a person must be a stranger to church history, (in which we see by so many instances, how tenacious the generality of Christians have

been in every age, of the faith in which they were brought up; and what disturbances have been caused, as often as the least point of the church's doctrine has been called in question,) that can imagine that all or any one of the articles of the primitive faith could ever be altered, without great opposition and disturbance; much less so insensibly, as that nobody should be able to tell how, when, or by whom the alteration was made.

CHAPTER II.

THE NATURE OF HERESY AND SCHISM.

HERESY, according to the Catholics, is "an obstinate adhesion to any error contrary to divine revelation, duly proposed to our belief by the Church of God; that is, contrary to what God has taught, and the church holds to be a revealed and apostolical truth; or, a wilful separation from the doctrine of the Catholic church in matters of faith. According to Protestants, "it is an obstinate defence of error against a necessary or fundamental article of Christian faith." But the ancient church knew nothing of this distinction; and therefore condemned all heretics that dissented from doctrine, whether the articles in which they dissented were of the number of those, which these gentlemen called fundamental or not. And certainly "an obstinate defence of error against any article which God has taught," must needs be a damnable sin; and what sin is it, if not heresy? and who shall be judge in these cases, what articles of Christian faith are necessary to be believed, if

not the church of God, which proposes them to our belief?

Schism, according to Catholics, "is a wilful separation from the unity and communion of the church, and the subordination due to the church governors." According to Protestants, it is "a causeless separation of one part of the church from another." But who shall be judge whether the separation be causeless, or not? Or can there be a just cause for a separation from the Catholic church, with which Christ has promised to abide for ever? St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Now the children of the primitive religion are very secure, that in adhering to their church guides, they are neither guilty of heresy nor schism. They cannot be guilty of heresy, because they hold nothing contrary to the definitions of the church, or to the word of God, as interpreted by the greatest authority upon earth, viz. that of the church of God. Much less can they be guilty of heresy, according to the Protestant notion of heresy, viz. of error in fundamentals; since our very adversaries are obliged to acknowledge, that our church does not err in fundamentals.

Besides, heresy, according to the scriptures, is a damnable crime, Gal. v. 20, 21; Titus, iii. 10, 11; 2 St. Pet. ii. 1, 2; St. Jude, 13. The malignity of which consists in wilfully refusing to believe that which God has taught, after it has been duly proposed to our belief, by such an authority, and upon such grounds, or motives of credibility, that it would be highly imprudent to doubt that God has taught it; in which case the refusing to believe, is highly injurious to God, by calling in question his truth. Now Catholics are very sure they are guilty of no such crime as this; because they refuse to believe no one revealed truth, which by sufficient authority and upon due grounds is proposed to their belief; and in all those things in which they believe differently from other Christians, they have on their side the greatest authority upon earth, and the strongest motives of all others to convince them that what they believe is the same as God has taught.

Moreover, the root of all heresy is pride and conceit of man's own judgment, which he prefers to all other authority; for an humble

man can never be a heretic. Therefore the followers of the old religion, who walk in the humble way of submission to the church authority, and take up nothing of their own invention, or upon any presumption of their own judgment, follow their guides of divine appointment, can never be guilty of the sin of heresy. Again:—The chief points of the doctrine of the Catholic religion, which are accused by our adversaries as grievous and pernicious errors, were certainly held long before the pretended reformation, by the whole eastern as well as western church; and consequently the holding of them could be no heresy at that time, when they were held by the universal church, which (as Protestant divines allow) never falls into heresy. Now if the holding of these articles was not heresy then, I would gladly know what can make it heresy at present? Not the word of God, which was the same then as it is now. Nor any new declaration of the word of God, or definition of the church or council; because the most authentic, and most universal that has been since, has been on the side of the Catholic.

And as we are secure against heresy by following the old religion, so are we also against the guilt of schism. Because we never broke off from the communion of any more ancient or superior church, or withdrew our obedience from any church governors, keeping within the bounds of a due subordination to our superiors. Now as rebellion in the state, so schism in the church, can only be when a lesser, or at least an inferior part, separates from the greater or superior; which, I have said, was never our case, who never went out from any greater or superior church; but in all divisions of religion, that ever yet have been, we have always had at the time of the beginning of such division, both a majority of number, and a pre-eminence of dignity and authority with respect of number, and pre-eminence of dignity and authority with respect to those that have been divided from us. We are the great body of christians descending from the apostles, from which all other sects at their first beginning separated themselves; and whose authority they all acknowledged before the separation. Therefore we cannot possibly be schismatics.

If it be objected that the guilt of schism lies at our door, for giving cause to it, by insisting upon terms of communion which could not in conscience be complied with, and casting out of our communion all those that refused to concur with our innovations: we answer, first, That it has always been the method of all schismatics to charge the church with giving cause to the schism. 2dly, That the pretence of conscience against church authority is also the cloak, by which all heretics and schismatics have sought to cover their obstinacy and pride: and that it has also been the way of all innovators to accuse the church of innovations. 3dly, That the church governors have been authorized by Christ to be judges in these cases, (St. Matt. v. 17,) and to cast out of the communion of the church such as obstinately refuse to hear and obey them. 4thly, That even supposing the case of an unjust excommunication, the person excommunicated is not thereby authorized to set up altar against altar; nor does the excommunicator thereby forfeit all authority, or become a schismatic. 5thly, That the person excommunicated, is not a competent judge of the justice or injustice

of the sentence of his superiors. 6thly, That in the case of modern sectaries, they did not stay till they were cast out of the church, but run out of it of their own accord, and enticed as many as they could to come out after them. In fine, that at the time when the division began, we only continued where we were, in the terms of communion which had been fixed long before; therefore they broke off from us, not we from them: as the ship breaks loose from the shore, not the shore from the ship; because the shore continues just where it was. From all which it is visible, that the schism is not on our side.

Besides, the professors of the Catholic religion wear none of the badges whereby scripture and antiquity will have us know and distinguish heretics and schismatics. Such as "preaching without being sent, Jerem. xxiii. 21; Rom. x. 15; Heb. v. 4. Not entering into the sheepfold by the door, but climbing up another way, St. John, x. 1. Going out of the established church, and the communion of the undoubted successors of the apostles, 1 St. John, ii. 19. Separating themselves, St. Jude, 19, causing divisions and

offences contrary to the doctrine which the children of the church have learnt, Rom. xvi. 17. Preaching to them a new gospel, Gal. i. 8, 9. Wolves in sheep's clothing, but easily known by their evil fruits, St. Matt. vii. 15, 16. Perpetually chopping and changing, and varying from their own rules, Tertullian de Præscript. chap. xlii. Rising long after the church from which they separated themselves, Tertullian, ibid. chap. xxxi. Where he gives us this rule to distinguish heretics by, as a sentence that shall stand for the condemnation of all future heresies. "Id esse dominicum et verum, quod est prius traditum; id autem extraneum et falsum quod est posterius immissum." That is of the Lord, and is true, which was of elder date; but that is foreign and false which came in later.

Now as it is evident that none of these marks of error and schism agree to the Catholic religion and its professors, so it is visible that they have all been found in every one of the modern sects: who all from their very first setting out, preached without any mission, either ordinary from the Church, or extraordinary from God; and consequently did not

enter into the sheepfold by the door; they all went out and separated themselves from the ordinary succession of the Church; "caused divisions and offences, preached a new gospel;" fell out immediately amongst themselves; and have ever since been daily varying in their doctrine, and uncertain what they would be at: in fine, have all from the very beginning brought forth such fruits, as could never spring from a good tree.

But setting all this aside, it is easy to prove the guilt of schism upon them all, from this plain matter of fact. At the time of their first origin, when they separated themselves from the Roman Catholic church, they did not embrace the communion of any other church then in being; but stood all alone upon their own bottom, divided from all churches upon earth, which was confessedly Luther's case, about the year 1517. Therefore if at that time there any where was a true church of Christ upon earth, (as there always is, if the scripture and creed be true,) the first authors of all these sects originally separated themselves from the true church of Christ, wheresoever or whichsoever she was; because they separated them

selves from all churches, pure or impure, which had any being upon earth before their time, and consequently they were all guilty of schism.

Neither is it much harder to prove the guilt of heresy upon them all. Because, from their very first setting out they all obstinately maintained sundry doctrines condemned by the universal Church, as heretical and contrary to divine revelation, many ages before. Now that which is once heresy, is always heresy; as that which is once truth, is always truth.

Nor is there indeed any rule by which the ancient or modern Arians, for example, can be proved to be heretics, but what will prove the same with regard to the sectaries of these days; both the one and the other were and are willing to be judged by the Scriptures as interpreted by themselves: both the one and the other have been condemned by the Scriptures as interpreted by the church. Therefore either both are heretics or neither.

CHAPTER III.

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

That the true church of Christ is always one, and can be but one in her faith and communion, appears from many texts of Scripture. Song of Solomon, vi. 9, 10. "My dove, my undefiled is but one--fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners." St. John x. 16. "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, (viz. the Gentiles, who were then divided from the Jews,) them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Ephes. iv. 4, 5. "There is one body, and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Rom. xii. 5. "We being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." St. John xvii. 20, 21. "Neither pray I for these alone (the apostles), but for them also that shall believe in me through the word, that they all may be one." Nor could the church or kingdom of Christ, long subsist without this unity. "For

every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." St. Matt. xii. 25.

Hence, where this unity is wanting, it is a certain mark that the true church of Christ is not there. And consequently that scheme of Protestants must fall to the ground, which maintains, that the church of Christ is not in one only communion; but is a collection of many disagreeing sects divided from each other in faith and communion: for here is no unity, and consequently, this cannot be the true system of the church of Christ, which, according to the Scripture and creed, is ever one.

For the same reason the reformation in general, or the reformed church taken in that latitude as to comprise the whole collection of Protestant sects, cannot be the true church of Christ; because it wants this mark or property of unity. Luther to his dying day looked upon the Zuinglians, and all that denied the real presence, as heretics and aliens from the church of God. (See his lesser confession, and his theses against the Lovanists, t. 7, fol.

503, 2.) His followers have inherited the same notions to this day, with regard to Calvinists. The Church of England Protestants look upon the dissenters as schismatics; and the dissenters avoid the communion of the established church, as not sufficiently purged from superstition and idolatry. Can this be the one fold of Christ? or can his sheep run so many opposite ways?

Nay, so far are Protestants in general from this unity, which is one of the marks of the church of Christ, that there are scarce the least footsteps of it to be found in any one sect or denomination of them: for, pick out which you please of these sects, and examine into their whole system of faith, and you will find no agreement either with one another, or with the first authors of their sect. In so much that, if you go to consult any two ministers, experience teaches they do not both agree throughout in their notions of religion; and neither the one, nor the other with the first reformers, whose systems they have all forsaken; nor are their disagreements in matters of small moment, but of the highest importance: some in every sect are Arians with

relation to the Trinity; many are Latitudinarians; great also are their differences with relation to "Church government, church authority, the necessity and nature of the sacraments, the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper; free will; predestination; and the state of souls departed; the necessity of faith in Christ for salvation; lay baptism, &c." The last of which controversies, as it is decided by most of the divines of the English Protestant church, unchristians, and consequently unchurches, not only all Dissenters, but also all the Lutherans and Calvinists, who having no bishops, consequently, in the system of these divines, have no other ministers than mere laymen.

Nor is there any way left amongst Protestants, for their church to put an end, by her authority, to these contests of her children; since they can never be persuaded that they are obliged to pay any greater deference to her decisions, than their forefathers, the first reformers, were to the decisions of the whole church then in being.

But how is it then with the Catholic Church, with regard to this unity, which is one of the

properties of the true church of Christ? Why she is one, by the union of all her children in one faith, and one uniform profession of faith, unalterable and inviolable, viz., that published by Pius IV., in maintaining every article whereof, all Catholics throughout the world unanimously agree. She is one by the union of all her children in one communion. And for the maintaining this one faith and communion, she has one visible head, and is guided by one church authority, to which all her children are bound to assent; and by which all disturbers of unity, and innovators of faith, are cut off from her unity.

So that the followers of the Catholic Church, in point of unity, have clearly many advantages above Protestants. 1st, because all Catholics agree in one confession or profession of faith: Protestant churches could never yet agree in any one such confession. 2dly, because all Catholics, however spread throughout the world, are in one and the same communion: Protestants are divided into many separate sects, which refuse to communicate one with another. 3dly, because all Catholics have one visible head of the church, one

apostolic see, the centre of unity, to which all are subject, and in which all are united. Protestants, as the learned Sir Edward Sands long ago complained, (Relations of the Religions of the West,) "are as severed, or other scattered troops, each drawing different ways, without any means to pacify their quarrels; no patriarch, one or more, to have a common superintendence or care of their churches, for correspondence and unity: no ordinary way to assemble a general council of their part, &c." 4thly, because Catholics embrace a rule of faith which must maintain them in unity, viz., the Word of God, as interpreted to them by the Church, to whose authority they all hold themselves bound to submit: so that if any dispute arise, when once the Church has interposed her judgment, whosoever presumes to dissent, is no longer looked upon by Catholics as one of their society, but as a heretic and a schismatic. Protestants, on the other side, maintain a rule of faith, which, human weakness considered, is utterly inconsistent with unity in religion, and cannot but be a perpetual source of endless divisions. Such is the Scripture, or Word of God, as inter-

preted by each one's private judgment. For when Protestants appeal to Scripture, as the only rule of faith, they do not mean the Scripture, as interpreted to them by the church; for if they had gone by this rule, their reformation would have been stifled in the very cradle; much less they mean the Scripture as interpreted by any particular minister or preacher; but as interpreted by every Christian of sound judgment, who has, according to the principles of the reformation, a right to interpret it for himself, and is no more obliged to follow the interpretation of Luther, for example, or of Calvin, or of any other divine, synod, or church, if their interpretation seem not to him agreeable to the true meaning of God's word, than they were obliged to follow the interpretation of the Catholic church. Whosoever disallows of this truly Protestant rule of faith, must condemn the reformation begun by a single man, in opposition to the whole world: and whosoever maintains this rule must consequently allow all those who steer by it to be true Protestants, however disagreeing their principles in religion may otherwise be, nay, though there were not two of them all that agreed in any

one single article, except this, of taking the Bible alone, as interpreted by themselves, for their rule of faith. Which indeed is the source of all their disagreements; so that there can be no hopes of their ever being united in one body, as long as they follow this rule of faith. So much have Catholics the advantage over Protestants in this point of unity.

As to disputes amongst Catholic divines, which our adversaries sometimes allege, in order to disprove the unity of the church: it may suffice for an answer to this objection, to remark two things. 1st, that these differences are never in matters decided by the church; and consequently are only in matters of opinion, never in matters of faith. 2dly, that these school questions make no breach of communion, and consequently divide not the unity of the church. Can Protestants say as much of the differences that are amongst them, which have no communion one with another?

CHAPTER IV.

COMMUNION WITH THE SEE OF PETER, THE CENTRE OF UNITY.

One great means for maintaining the Church in unity, was the institution of one chief pastor to have a superiority and superintendence over the rest; that so all being subjected to one, might be united in one centre; upon this account, as the holy fathers have observed, our Lord made choice of St. Peter, to make him the chief and head among the apostles, "that a head being constituted," says St. Jerome, (lib. 1, contra Jovin.) "occasion of schism might be taken away." Ut capite constituta, schismatis tolleretur occasio. See also St. Cyprian, lib. de Unitate Ecclesiæ, St. Optatus, lib. 2, contra Parmenianum, &c.

In effect, nothing can be more evident from Scripture, than that our Lord did make St. Peter the chief pastor of the church; giving him a name that implied no less than a rock or foundation stone, St. John, i. 42; St. Matt. xvi. 18; promising him "the keys of the king-

dom of heaven, with the chief power of binding and loosing," v. 19, praying for him that "his faith might not fail," and giving him the commission to confirm his brethren, viz., the rest of the apostles, St. Luke, xxii. 31, 32. In fine, three times committing to his care all his lambs and all his sheep, without exception, that is, his whole flock, St. John, xxi. 15, &c. after having asked him, "Dost thou love me more than these?"

And as our Lord was pleased to constitute one head among the apostles, in the person of St. Peter, as the best preservative against schism, and the best form of church government; so it is not in the least to be questioned, but that he designed the same form of government to continue in his church till the end of the world; and that St. Peter's prerogative should descend to his successors: for how can any Christian imagine Christ should appoint a head for the government of his church, and maintaining of unity during the apostles' time, and design another kind of government for succeeding ages, when there was like to be so much more need of a head? Consequently it must be granted that St.

Peter's supremacy was by divine institution to descend to his successors: and these successors are no others than the bishop of Rome. For neither has the church of God ever acknowledged any others, nor have any others claimed the title of St. Peter's successors; and in that quality exercised jurisdiction in all parts of the church from the earliest times of Christianity.

Hence the holy fathers have frequently appealed to the Roman succession and tradition, as the touchstone of orthodox faith; have looked upon the Roman chair as the centre of Catholic unity, and ever alleged the communion with the apostolic see as a mark of the true church, and an invincible argument against all sectaries. Witness the following testimonies:

1. St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, and martyr in the second century, who in his younger days had been a hearer of St. Polycarp, disciple of the apostles, in his third book against all heresies, chap. 3, thus delivers himself. "Because it would be an endless business, in a work like this, to trace up the succession of all the churches; we allege the tradition

which that greatest and most ancient church, well known to all, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, has received from the apostles, and the faith which has been there delivered, coming down to us by succession of bishops; and so we confound all those who, either through a wicked self-complacence or vain glory, or else through blindness and error of judgment, make unlawful assemblies (præterquam oportet colligunt). For to this church, by reason of its more powerful principality, (propter potentiorem, or as others read it, potiorem principalitatem,) it is necessary that every church has recourse, (necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam,) that is, the faithful on all sides. In which [church] the apostolical tradition has always been preserved by those that are in every place.

After this he sets down the succession of the bishops of Rome thus. "The apostles having founded and established the church, entrusted the episcopal ministry to Linus, who is mentioned by St. Paul in his epistle to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus. After him Clement, the third from the apostles,

inherited the bishopric, who also had seen the blessed apostles, and conversed with them. To this Clement succeeded Evaristus; Alexander; to whom succeeded Xystus, sixth from the apostles. After him came Telesphorus, who also suffered a glorious martyrdom. Then Hyginus; after him Pius. To whom succeeded Anicetus, who had for his successor Soter. And now Eleutherius, in the twelfth place from the apostles, inherits the bishopric. By this order and succession the tradition of the apostles in the church, and the preaching of the truth has come down to us. And this is a full evidence, [plenissima ostentio, a most clear demonstration] that it is one and the same life-giving faith, which from the apostles' days has been preserved in the church till now." So far St. Irenæus.

2. Tertullian, writer of the same age, makes use of the same argument against all heretics, (Lib. præscript. chap. 36.) "Come on now," says he, "you who have a mind to exercise a audable curiosity in the concern of your salvation. Run through the apostolic churches, in which to this day is maintained a succession in the very chairs of the apostles, (apud quas ipsæ

adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis præsidentur locis.) If you are near Italy, you have Rome, from whence we also (Africans) have authority at hand. A church happy in her condition, to which the apostles bequeathed their whole doctrine with their blood: here Peter was honoured with the resemblance of the Lord's passion: here Paul was crowned with the martyrdom of the Baptist; here John the apostle, after coming out without hurt from the burning oil, received sentence of banishment in an island. Let us see what this church has learnt, what she has taught, &c." Where he goes on, confuting all the prevailing heresies of those days by the doctrine of the church of Rome.

3. St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, and martyr in the third century, in 55th epistle to Pope Cornelius, complaining of certain African schismatics, delivers himself in this manner. "Moreover they dare to cross the seas, and carry letters from their schismatical and profane faction to the chair of Peter and the principal church from which the priestly unity has its origin, (Ecclesiam, principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est,) not considering that the Romans are they whose faith was

praised by the apostles, (Rom. i.) to whom false faith (perfidia) has no access."

4. St. Optatus, bishop of Milevis in Numidia, and one of the principal champions of the church of God against the Donatists, in his sacred book against Parmenianus the Donatist, bishop of Carthage, thus addresses himself to his adversary. "You cannot pretend to be ignorant that Peter held fast the bishop's chair in the city of Rome, in which Peter, head of all the apostles, sat—in which one chair, unity might be maintained by all; lest the rest of the apostles should each one claim his own separate chair. So that he is now a schismatic and offender, who against this single chair erects any other. In this one chair, which is the first of the properties of the church, Peter first sat; to him succeeded Linus, to him Clement, &c.; to Liberius succeeded Damasus; to Damasus, Siricius, the present bishop; with whom we (the Catholics of Africa) and all the world communicate. Give you now an account of the origin of your chair, you who claim to yourselves the holy catholic church." So far St. Optatus.

5. St. Jerome, writing to Pope Damasus,

Epist. 57, Anno 376. "Because the east, divided by intestine jars, rends in pieces the seamless coat of Christ,—so that in the midst of these broken cisterns, that hold no water, it is hard to find out the sealed fountain and enclosed garden: therefore have I thought it proper to consult the chair of Peter, and that faith which was praised by the mouth of the apostle, seeking from thence food for my soul, where I first put on the garment of Christ. I am joined in communion with your holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter: upon that rock I know the church is built: whoever eats the Lamb out of this house is profane; whosoever is not in the ark shall perish in the deluge. I know not Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I am ignorant of Paulinus, (he speaks of the three that at that time contended for the patriarchal see of Antioch:) Whosoever gathers not with thee, scatters; that is, he who is not of Christ, belongs to Antichrist."

And in his 58th epistle to the same Pope. "On one side of me, the Arian fury rages, supported by the secular power; on the other side, the church (of Antioch) divided in three parts, seeks to draw me to her. In the mean

time I cry out, whosoever is joined with the apostolical see, he is my man." So far St. Jerome.

6. St. Augustin, in his psalm against the Donatists, thus speaks to these schismatics. "Come, brethren, if you have a mind to be engrafted in the vine, it is a pity to see you lie lopped off in this manner from the stock. Reckon up the prelates in the very see of Peter; and in that order of fathers, see which has succeeded which. This is the rock over which the proud gates of hell prevail not." He makes use of the same argument of the succession of bishops of Rome from St. Peter, against the Donatists, in his 165th epistle to Generosus: and against the Manichæans and all other heretics, in his book of the Advantage of believing, c. 17.

And in his book against the epistle of Manichæus, which was called the Foundation, chap. 4, he gives it amongst other arguments or motives of credibility, which made him prefer the Catholic communion to all others; where he writes as follows: "Not to speak of that most sincere wisdom, which you (Manichæans) do not believe to be in the Catholic

church, there are many other things which most justly hold me in her communion. 1. The agreement of people and nations. 2. Her authority begun by miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, confirmed by antiquity. 3. A succession of priests descending from Peter the Apostle, to whom Christ after his resurrection, committed his flock to the present bishop. Lastly, the very name of Catholic, of which this church alone has, not without reason, in such manner kept the possession, that though all heretics desire to be called Catholics, if a stranger were to ask them where the Catholics go to church, none of them all has the face to point out his own church or meeting-house." So far St. Augustin. And let the world judge by this, what his sentiments would be of modern sectaries.

From all that has been said in this section, we gather the following arguments in favour of the ancient religion. 1. We alone communicate with the successors of Peter, to whom Christ committed his whole flock: therefore, we alone are the sheep of Christ. 2dly. The chair of Peter was, according to all antiquity, established by Christ to be the cen-

tre of unity to the whole Church: we alone are united to this centre of unity. 3dly. The Roman succession and tradition is ever urged by the fathers as an invincible argument against all sectaries: this succession and tradition is wholly on our side.

CHAPTER V.

CHANGE OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND WAS MADE WITHOUT THE FREE CONSENT OF THE CLERGY.

When our adversaries say, that the changes in religion, (which they call reformation) were made in direct opposition to the Church authority and lawful superiors; the common answer is, that though this may be true of foreign parts, yet in England the bishops and the whole clergy freely reformed themselves by their own authority, without any previous threats or fears, or any interested compliance with the designs of the court.

This, if true, could neither justify the reformation, nor hinder it from being made against a lawful and superior church authority, as will appear by and by. But indeed the fact was quite otherwise. For the greater part of the English clergy never consented to the reformation, till it was not safe to oppose it. This is proved unanswerably in 5th part of Church government. I shall only mention a few particulars; which yet, perhaps, may be sufficient to let the reader know, that the Eng-

lish reformation in all its three changes was a mere creature of the state.

1. The reformation began in the 22d year of King Henry VIII., was carried on in the minority of King Edward VI., and finished by Queen Elizabeth. As to the present state of it, it is wholly owing to her. For what King Henry, and the Duke of Somerset had done in his pupil's name, was all repealed by the joint authority of church and state, in Queen Mary's reign. The original cause of the reformation was this: King Henry VIII. finding the Pope would not agree to let him put away Queen Catherine, (after he had lived with her in marriage above twenty years) that he might be able to do it himself, resolved to take upon him the new title of Supreme head of the Church of England in spirituals. This was to strip the Pope at once of a two-fold title of spiritual supremacy over him and his subjects. First, as St. Peter's successor in the care of the whole Church. Secondly, as the western Patriarch. The first of these titles, when Luther began to question it, had been asserted briskly by King Henry VIII., who had, upon that account, received from the Pope the title

of Defender of the Faith. The Pope's second claim admitted of no dispute, it being an uncontested fact, that in spiritual concerns the island had been nine hundred years under him as Patriarch, or chief Metropolitan of the west. But the king being resolved to be the only spiritual head of his people, brought the clergy over to his side by this stratagem. He demands an hundred thousand pounds of them for the expenses, which, by their faults, he said he had been at in procuring authentic testimonies of foreign universities against his marriage. The clergy refusing to give so great a sum, he cast them under a premunire, so that now they are liable to be imprisoned, and to have their estates confiscated at his pleasure. For their ransom they offer a hundred thousand pounds, but are told by the court, that it is too late unless they will also own the king's supremacy. They consent with this reserve, as far as is consistent with the laws of Christ. But the king will have no limitation. They must either absolutely submit, or the premunire must be executed. The whole is related by Archbishop Parker in his Antiq. Brit. p. 326. Thus was the first and main

article of the reformation gained. And we see what mighty freedom the clergy had in it. I must call it the main article, because the spiritual supremacy of the crown gave both a being and authority to all the other parts of the reformation. For none of the three reforming princes undertook that work either in the name or by the authority of the clergy, but only by virtue of their spiritual supremacy, and as supreme judges in controversies of religion.

King Henry carried the reformation no farther. However he took care it should never be in the power of the clergy to oppose the court in matters of religion. For he peremptorily required of them, says Dr. Heylin, that no constitution or ordinance shall be hereafter by the clergy enacted, promulged, or put in execution, unless the king's highness approve it. And to this, says he, on the 15th of May, 1532, they made their absolute submission. Thus far then these gentlemen make but a mean figure in the reformation.

2. In the first year of King Edward VI., (a child ten years old,) the clergy was assembled to push it forward. But nothing could be got

from them. On the contrary, the convocation offered a remonstrance to the king, (recorded by Dr. Stillingfleet, Iren. part 2, chap. 8,) that statute should pass concerning religion, without the assent of the clergy. Nothing surely could be more reasonable, if it was to be their act. But this could not be obtained.

3. In the third and fourth year of the same prince, the Parliament authorized sixteen laymen and as many of the clergy, (whom the court should nominate,) to make what changes they, or the greater part of them, thought fit in the laws of the church. So that here one clergyman's vote, (and it is strange if the court could not find one for their purpose,) joined with sixteen laymen, was enough to carry on the reformation, against the whole body of the clergy. But before this the Duke of Somerset, in King Edward's name, had made almost a general reformation through the realm. For it was not thought safe to let it be done by the clergy, both Mr. Fuller and Dr. Heylin confess.

4. The forty-two articles of that religion, An. 1552, carry in their front the name of a synod. Indeed the clergy had now been five

years in modelling, as it were on a stage, new players coming in, and the old ones being cast out, says Fox, p. 1180. But Mr. Fuller lets his readers know, that these articles were not really made by any synod at all: and the true reason, says he, why the king could not trust the diffusive body of the convocation with a power of meddling with matters of religion, was a just jealousy which he had of the ill affection of the major part thereof, L. 7, Hist. p. 420.

Bishop Ridley gives us the same account. The most part of the clergy, says he, parsons, prebendaries, archdeacons, deans, and bishops too, for the most part, were never persuaded in their hearts (of the reformation) but from the teeth forward, and for the king's sake; Fox, p. 1616. So that if King Edward's reformation had been left to the clergy, it had never been made at all.

5. It is no small confirmation of this, that when a synod was called within five or six days after Queen Mary's coronation, and before any new moulding of the ecclesiastical body, all but six voted against King Edward's reformation.

6. Queen Elizabeth, as Dr. Heylin fairly owns, went the same way to work in the reformation, which her two predecessors, King Henry and King Edward, had done before her. That is, she did all by her own authority. But when the times, says he, were better settled, (that is, when she had changed, frightened, punished, and overawed the clergy,) she left church-work to the disposing of church-men. Thus Dr. Heylin, Eccles. Vind. § 6, p. 36. Indeed she might safely do it.

7. Her first parliament gives her full power and authority (by virtue of this act) to name and authorize such persons as her majesty shall think meet to reform the nation. Act I. Elizabeth, c. i. Though all the bishops, that were then in parliament, opposed this statute. Camden, I. Elizabeth. And, now, without making use of any one clergyman, she can reform the whole clergy.

8. She stood, doubtless, in need of a pretty large commission. For Dr. Heylin gives this account of her clergy: "The bishops at that time," says he, "were reduced to a narrower number than ever before; there being no more

than fifteen of that sacred order alive. These, being called by some of the lords of the council, were required to take the oath of supremacy." Kitchen of Landaff, (whom Camden states the calamity of his see,) only takes it; who having formerly submitted to every change under King Henry VIII., King Edward VI., and Queen Mary, resolved to show himself no changeling in not conforming himself to the pleasures of the higher powers. By all the rest it was refused. Whereupon they were deprived of their bishopricks. And with them fifteen presidents of colleges, twelve deans, twelve archdeacons, six abbots, and fifty prebendaries were removed.

9. As to the convocation, which sat the same time with her first parliament, Mr. Fuller writes thus of it, L. 9. "It is observed in nature, that when one twin is of an unusual strength and bigness, the other born with it is weak, and dwindles away; so here, Queen Elizabeth's first parliament being very active in matters of religion, the convocation, younger brother thereunto, was little employed, less regarded. It seems church busi-

ness was not yet to be trusted in the hands of churchmen.

10. The same historian, (L. 9, p. 54,) copied from the authentic register, the following articles signed by the convocation and both universities.

First. In the sacrament of the altar, after consecration, the natural body and blood of Christ is really present under the appearance of bread and wine.

2. The substance of bread and wine does not remain after consecration.

3. In the Mass, is offered the true body and blood of Christ, a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

4. The chief power of governing the church of Christ upon earth was given to St. Peter, and to his lawful successors in the see apostolic, as to vicars of Christ. To these the convocation added:

5. The authority of treating and defining matters relating to faith, sacraments, and church discipline, has always hitherto belonged, and ought only to belong to the pastors of the church, whom the Holy Ghost

has appointed in it for that end, and not laymen.

If these few instances be not enough to convince any impartial reader, that the body of the clergy came not into the reformation by their own free will and unbiassed choice, I must confess I know not what evidence means. But I have still an observation or two to make.

The first is notorious in the highest degree, and Dr. Heylin has publicly confessed it, that the reformation was not an effect of pure zeal, but qualified with a desire, not altogether spiritual, of church lands and treasures of an immense value. The grand object, plunder. The first royal plunderer, and his trusty adherents in both houses of parliament, had the largest and best share of the prize.

But still there were many sweetbits left both for the crown and nobility, that it should afterwards engage in so Christian and profitable an undertaking. And having such a prodigious gain in hand, and heaven at a much easier purchase than formerly, it is no wonder that the reformation went on in spite of the clergy, who all got little by it. Some

of them opposed the court projects, and by suffering, taught others to conform. The greatest part had no vocation to martyrdom, and so were forced to submit. The second observation is, that King Henry and Queen Elizabeth (besides the fairest prospect imaginable of enriching themselves and their friends,) had other powerful views, which made the reformation necessary. He had no other means to be rid of Queen Catherine; and Queen Elizabeth being born of a second wife whilst the first was living, knew very well (says Dr. Heylin,) that her title to the crown and the Pope's supremacy could not stand together; and that she could not maintain the one without a discarding of the other. She found then one of the greatest interests upon earth in the reformation, which was probably the reason of her being so much more clear-sighted than her clergy.

I observe, thirdly, that since the Pope (even setting aside that supremacy which he has from St. Peter's successor,) had another undoubted one over England, as the western patriarch, confirmed by the practice of nine hundred years, which therefore gave him a

more ancient title over the kingdom in spiritual concerns, than any of the royal plunderers could perhaps show they had to the crown; it was but just, that the clergy should have freely debated a matter, in which their own duty, as well as the conscience of their sovereign, was so immediately concerned. But it seems the court was of another opinion in all the three reigns.

If you say, 1st, That what King Edward did by the advice of his privy council, was approved by Cranmer, (Archbishop of Canterbury,) who was in it, I answer, 1st, That the same form would have been used, though Cranmer had dissented. 2. That he did not act there as Archbishop of Canterbury. 3. What is this to the body of the clergy?

If you say, 2dly, That all the acts of parliament were made by the lords spiritual and temporal, I answer, that this form too is used, though all the bishops vote against the act. As happened in Queen Elizabeth's first parliament, for reformation.

If you say, 3dly, That in her time the clergy approved it, I answer, it was not so in the beginning; for then the bishops, the convocation, and both universities were against

it. And if afterwards the clergy consented, it was not till they had seen lives and livings ost, incumbents changed, and that it was utterly unsafe to resist the measures of the court. If the Pope had used the same method in the Council of Trent, if he had made a great number of the bishops incapable of preferments, had he deprived them of their bishoprics, loaded them with chains, or sent them into banishment to frighten the rest, would the council have been free? Yet this was all the liberty that Queen Elizabeth's clergy had when they consented to the reformation. It was just such a consent as is given to a highway robber when he presents a pistol to the breast of his victim, whose money he demands under pain of death.

But let us suppose after all, that they had given their consent with all the freedom imaginable, it must still be owned, that the reformation was made in opposition to a lawful church authority, even setting aside the question of the Pope's supremacy by divine right. Unless we imagine that many hundred years are not enough to fix the right of a metropolitan; that parts are not subject to the

whole; and that the whole body of Catholic pastors has no authority over a few dissenting prelates. For 1st, the English bishops, with their clergy, had been a part of the western patriarchate from their conversion to Christianity. 2dly, They were also a part of the whole Catholic clergy, against whose will and authority they made the change called by them reformation. Hence these two important truths of necessity follow.

First, That England, before the reformation, was subject to a foreign right in the concerns of religion, and that this right is such as no human power can overrule. Because as a part of Christ's church it was subject to the whole. And no monarch can pretend to deprive the whole church of Christ of that spiritual power, which Christ himself was pleased to give it over its members, no more than Herod or Pontius Pilate could, and surely they had none at all.

It follows, secondly, That the reformation cannot be justified.

For, first, it is against common sense to say, that twenty-six bishops are included in the whole, and yet not subject to the authority and

censures of it. It was, says Mr. Thorndike, a contradiction for the church of England to pray for the Catholic church, and the unity of it, and yet to renounce the jurisdiction of the whole church, and the general councils thereof over England. (Due ways of composing Diff. p. 7.)

Secondly, it is clear by the universal tradition of all ages, that the supreme authority of deciding controversies in religion is in the main body of Catholic pastors, so that a few dissenting bishops, (as twenty-six, against many hundreds,) of how fair a character soever, are not to be regarded. But should they be forced to give their consent under fear of death, as was the case with most of them, it makes the affair look worse. But what shall we say of Elizabeth's bishops who never received any ordination? Surely they had no authority over the whole church of God, no more than any other twenty laymen.

Thirdly, if twenty-six bishops may outvote many hundreds, even all the bishops of the whole church of Christ, six or a much less number, may outvote twenty-six, and by this means it will be impossible for the faithful to

know certainly who are the judges and guides whom they ought to follow: unless the people must take the cause into their own hands, and constitute themselves judges over those of Christ's appointment, and overrule their pastors whom the Holy Ghost appointed to rule the church of God. That is, unless they must invert the whole order of judicature which Christ established for them in his church, when he appointed them "pastors and teachers, that they might not be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine: the faith of which pastors the people ought to follow." Eph. iv. 11, 14; Heb. xiii. 7.

CHAPTER VI.

OF INFALLIBILITY.

THE Church of Christ is infallible in all her decisions relating to matters of faith. This is a truth grounded upon the most express and positive promise of Christ. 1. "That the gates of hell (the power of darkness and error) shall not prevail against his church," Matt. xvi. 16, which undoubtedly they would, if she were corrupted in her faith. 2. "That the spirit of truth," John xvi. 13, and that "for ever," John xiv. 16; Matt. xxviii. 20, which therefore cannot be understood of the apostles only, because they were not to remain here for ever.

It is upon these clear promises we believe the church of Christ to be infallible in her faith. And it follows from it, that in all controversies of religion, when the church has once pronounced sentence, all safely may and ought to submit to her judgment. For surely he must have very little sense, who is afraid of being misled, when he follows the directions of an infallible guide.

To render this submission still more rational, the Holy Ghost has taken care to establish the church's authority in the plainest and strongest terms. First, our blessed Redeemer has already pronounced sentence on those who will not hear his church: but "if he will not hear the church," says he, "let him be to thee a heathen and a publican," Matt. xviii. 17; which, if true in private disputes, is more evidently so in public controversies of a higher concern. In another place he thus settles the authority of scriptural guides: "He that hears you, hears me: and he that despises you, despises me." Luke x. 16.

Secondly, St. Paul positively affirms that the church of Christ is "the pillar and ground of truth," 1 Tim. iii. 15, which cannot be true if she be capable of seducing her children by false doctrines. Upon this principle, in his epistle to the Hebrews, he instructs them in the important lesson of submission to their spiritual guides: "obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves." Heb. xiii. 17. And speaking of the same guides, "whose faith follow," says he, Heb. v. 7.

Again, writing to the Ephesians, he lets

them know "that God has appointed and placed in his church apostles, prophets, and evangelists, also pastors and teachers," Eph. iv. 11. For what end? v. 12, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the mystical body of Christ." How long? v. 13, "till we all come to the unity of faith." For what end? v. 14, "that henceforth we be no more like children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the slight of cunning men, lying in wait to deceive." This is evidently spoken in reference to the people who are here taught, first, that the pastors of the church are appointed by God himself to be their guides in faith; secondly, that these guides shall continue in the church of Christ without ceasing, to the end of the world, "till we all come to the unity of faith;" thirdly, that in all controversies of religion, it belongs to these guides to fix the wavering judgment of the people against all the wicked arts of impostors and seducers, and that the faithful ought to rely on their directions with an entire confidence.

For unless they may be safely depended on,

they would not fully answer the end of their institution; the people, especially the ignorant, upon every new difficult debate, would be left to an uncertainty. But God has established his covenant upon better promises, Heb. viii. 6, who has settled upon earth a visible church, which is the pillar and ground of truth, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, and to which he has promised the spirit of truth for ever. So that I leave any one to judge whether they who refuse to submit their private reason to the authority of this church, be not in danger of being self-convicted at the great tribunal of God?

Hence I infer, first, that whosoever is a member of any church, that owns itself to be fallible, and subject to errors in faith, is not a member of the church to which Christ has promised his Spirit for ever.

I infer, secondly, that he is not a member of the true church, because only that church which Christ established, and to which he made that promise, is the true one. And I leave it to him to consider whether any man can hope to attain salvation who lives wilfully out of the communion of that church which

Christ came to establish for the salvation of mankind, and of which it is said, Acts xi. 47, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."

I infer, thirdly, that the church of Christ can never be under any necessity of having her faith reformed. For if she can never fall into any errors destructive to the faith revealed by God, what need can there be of any such reformation?

I infer, lastly, that if all men had but faith enough to believe the church established by Christ himself to be our guide, and humility enough to submit their judgment to hers, there had never been any heresy in the Christian world, which, as it shows on the one hand the excellency of Christ's institution, so on the other, it is a dreadful instance of the pride and misery of mankind, who had rather lose heaven by presumption than gain it by following better lights than their own. Isaias thus prophesies: "The Redeemer shall come to Sion, &c. My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed,

says the Lord, from henceforth and forever." Is. lix. 20, 21. "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations," Ps. lxxii. Heb. v. 5, which is a plain and positive prediction that the church's infallibility was to be perpetual, and last to the end of the world.

Dan. chap. ii., interpreting the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, v. 34, 35, "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet, and broke them to pieces, and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." V. 44, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and it shall stand for ever."

Psalm lxxxix. relates also to Christ and his church; v. 3 and 4: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant: thy seed (Christ and his church) will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations." V. 27, &c. "I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand

fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquities with stripes. Nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail; my covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." Which glorious promise is understood of the church, the spiritual seed of David, by Calvin, L. 4, Inst. c. 1, sect. 27.

CHAPTER VII.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROTESTANT RULE OF FAITH AND JUDGE OF CONTROVERSIES.

First. If scripture alone, as interpreted by every private Christian for himself, were the whole rule of Christian faith, and only judge in religious controversy, without taking along with it the traditions of the apostles and the interpretations of the church, this very thing ought to have been clearly expressed in scripture; it being of the utmost consequence for every Christian to know by what rule he is to steer in matters of faith, and to what judge he is to have recourse for the decision of such controversies. Now, there is not one text in the whole scripture that clearly and expressly affirms that the scripture alone is the whole rule of Christian faith, and only judge in religious controversy, much less is there any text that clearly affirms that the scripture, as interpreted by every private Christian, is such a rule or such a judge. Therefore the Protestant system of religion is a

building without a foundation, their very rule of faith having no grounds for it in scripture.

If they shall here allege, Is. viii. 20, "To the law and to the testimony," or the words of Christ to the Jews, St. John v. 39, "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life," or what is said in commendation of the Bereans, Acts xvii. 11, for their searching the scriptures; what St. Paul writes, 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, of the holy scriptures, which Timothy had known from a child, that they are able through faith in Jesus Christ to make him wise unto salvation, and that "all scripture is profitable for doctrine," &c. All this falls infinitely short of proving that the scripture alone is the whole rule of Christian faith, and the sole judge of controversies. First, because not one of these texts speaks home to the point which ought to be proved, much less is clear and express for it. 2dly, because it is visible that all these texts of scripture then extant, that is, of the Old Testament only; which none of our adversaries will pretend to be the whole rule of Christian faith. 3dly, because what is said in these texts no ways excludes the interpretation of

the church, or authorizes any man to prefer his own private interpretation to that of the church of God. On the contrary, the scripture itself expressly tells us, 2 Pet. i. 20, that no prophecy of the scripture is of private interpretation; and 2 Pet. iii. 16, that in the scripture are things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest to their own destruction.

2. The scripture alone cannot be the whole rule of faith: Because one great article of Christian faith is, to believe that these books are divine scripture: now this we could never have known, but by the tradition and declaration of the church. For the scripture itself nowhere gives us a catalogue of the canonical books: it nowhere affirms, that all and every one of those books which are contained in the Protestant Bible or Testament, are the infallible word of God. Our adversaries therefore are very unhappy in their choice of a rule of faith, which is not only without any foundation from the scripture, but even excludes the scripture from being any part of their faith, as not coming under their only rule, by which they pretend to steer in matters of faith.

3. As by the scripture alone they never could certainly know what books are canonical, and what not; so by the scripture alone, they could never tell certainly that those books which they now have, are the same as those which were written so long ago by the prophets and apostles. For what text of scripture assures them of this? nay, by the scripture alone they cannot be assured that there is so much as one verse in their whole Bible and Testament which has not been corrupted. How then can the Bible and Testament, which they now have, without having recourse to the tradition and authority of the Catholic church, be the whole rule of Christian faith?

4. By the scripture alone they can never know, at least, with certainty absolutely, what is the true meaning of the written word in points controverted among Christians: for if in these they will not allow the whole church of God, or her general councils to be infallible in their interpretations, how much less can they themselves pretend to be infallibly certain of that sense which they put upon the scripture: especially when their interpretation contradicts that of all other Christians,

and even the plain and obvious meaning of the words themselves; as in the case of this controverted text, St. Matt. xxvi. 26: "This is my body." How then can the scripture alone be the proper judge of such controversies, or afford them any certainty of faith in these matters, when at the very most they can have no more certainty than an uncertain opinion, that their interpretation is better than that of other Christians?

5. In all our controversies of religion, the meaning of the scripture is the very thing in debate, and the main subject of the controversy: how then can the scripture alone be the proper judge to decide the controversy?

6. It is the office of a judge to hear both sides; and then to come to a definite sentence, so clear, that both parties must plainly understand on which side sentence is given. Does the scripture do this in our controversies? or what controversy was ever ended by scripture alone?

7. Many things necessary to be known by all Christians, or at least by their pastors and teachers, are not plain in scripture, and the controversies which have risen about these

things among Christians, cannot be clearly decided by scripture alone. Therefore there must be some other rule of Christian faith, and some other judge of controversies. For example, all Christians, or at least pastors and parents, ought to know whether infant baptism be valid or not; whether it be a duty incumbent upon them to procure and administer it, or whether it be a sacrilege to attempt it? And yet where is there a clear text of scripture that decides this great controversy? All Christians are obliged to know the sabbath, which by divine law they are obliged to keep: and yet where is the clear text of scripture that informs them that Christian sabbath ought to be the Sunday, and not the Saturday? All Christians, or at least the pastors of the church, are obliged to know in what manner baptism is to be administered, in order to the validity of the performance; whether sprinkling may suffice, or whether immersion or dipping, which was certainly used by the apostles, be necessary? Whether baptism by heretics be valid or not; that so they may know in what manner to receive into the church such as have been baptized by them?

Whether ministers only, or laymen also, may baptize, or consecrate? Whether Christians may lawfully go to war? may swear before a magistrate? may go to law? &c. Now not one of these things can be clearly made out by scripture alone.

8. Scripture was not the first rule of Christian faith, but the unwritten word of Christ, preached and delivered by the living voice of the pastors of the church, before the New Testament was written: how came this first rule to lose its authority? The apostles in their writings refer to their unwritten word; this they command the faithful to stand to. 2 Thessal. ii. 15. And they pronounce an anathema against all those that shall presume to alter it. Gal. i. 8, 9. How then comes the written word to be the whole rule of Christian faith?

9. Faith comes (not by reading, but) by hearing, according to the apostle, Rom. x. 17. Therefore the word of God, which is the rule of Christian faith, is the word which is preached, and not barely the written word.

10. We do not find in scripture or tradition, that our Lord ever commanded his dis-

ciples to write, but to preach: we do not find that the apostle took any care to translate the scriptures into the vulgar languages of the people whom they converted to the faith. Therefore it is not probable, that either our Lord designed that the scripture should be the whole rule of Christian faith, or that the apostle ever believed it to be such. Now, even had the apostles translated the scriptures, and given a copy to every one converted by their preaching, yet this would not lessen their authority to teach all nations, and preach the gospel to every creature.

11. This system by which the scripture is made the whole rule of Christian faith, and only judge in all controversies of religion, sets all, both ancient and modern heretics, out of the reach of the church authority, and abolishes all possible means of suppressing heresy, or restoring unity to the church, which can never be hoped for as long as every private Christian is authorized to prefer his own comments on scripture to the judgment of the whole church, and may, nay, ought, like Luther, to stand alone by his own interpretations, against all that dissent from them,

though it should be the whole church of God, of all ages, and all nations.

12. This system, while it pretends to reverence the scripture, is indeed highly injurious to it, by prostituting it to the caprice of every fanatic and enthusiast, and authorizing him to interpret it according to his own private fancy, and to father the notions of his own brain (as we daily see many do) upon the sacred word of God. My God and open Bible, say they. But do they by this intend to signify that they reject the church of Christ, and despise and disregard its authority, although appointed by Christ to teach all nations, and which He promised to be with even to the end of the world? If so, I would not like to be in their situation. The consequence of which is, that amongst those that acknowledge no other rule, no other judge but scripture alone, are almost as many religions as men; according to the infinite variety of their whimsical comments upon the word of God, and this without any prospect of their ever coming to any agreement.

13. This way of thinking has brought back almost all the old, condemned heresies, and

given rise to innumerable new ones; there being no sentiment in religion so absurd, or so abominable, but some or other of these have maintained it for the pure word of God, by virtue of this rule of scripture alone, explained by their own private interpretation.

14. As all, both old and new heresies, are justly fathered upon this principle, which gave birth to them all; so all, both ancient and modern sectaries, that steer by this truly Protestant rule, must be acknowledged to be true Protestants, let their other principles in religion be what they will; nay, though there were not two men among them all that agree in any one single article, except this, of taking the Bible alone, as interpreted by themselves, for the rule of their faith: now, whether the taking in all these sects, by virtue of this common rule of their faith, be any honour to the rule or to the reformation, let Protestants themselves judge.

15. The Church of God from the very beginning, never allowed private Christians to steer in matters of religion by the Bible, as interpreted by themselves; or to appeal from her decisions, to their own interpretations of the scrip-

ture: of which there needs no other proof than her condemning all ancient heresies by the scripture as she understood it. Therefore the Protestant rule of scripture alone as interpreted by themselves, is not the apostolical rule of the primitive Christians.

16. In every well ordered kingdom or commonwealth, let the law be ever so perfect, it is always found necessary, that besides the letter of the law, there should be courts of judicature, or judges, to decide all controversies which may arise, without which precaution there could be no end to lawsuits and contentions. And it would be justly looked upon as the greatest of all extravagancies, for any lawgiver to make a set of laws, and then to ordain, that in all disputes, which might afterwards arise, these laws should be the only judges to decide the matters in debate: and that each one of the contending parties should be obliged to stand to no other judgment than his own interpretation of the law. Such a regulation as this, would be justly looked upon as highly extravagant; because the necessary consequence of it would be the filling the whole kingdom with endless jars, dis-

order and confusion. What then can it be less than impeaching the wisdom of Christ, to imagine that he has left no living judges in his church, no court of judicature to decide our religious controversies, but only the letter of the law, that is, of the scripture, as interpreted by each one for himself? From which what else could follow, but that instead of truth and unity, we must be, without remedy, exposed to endless contention and errors?

17. It cannot be denied, but that God, who is truth itself, and can approve of nothing but the truth, has a sincere will that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth. 1 Tim. ii. 4. And that these endless jars, this multitude of sects, this total breach of communion amongst Christians, can never be agreeable to him, who above all things has recommended unity to his followers, and earnestly prayed for their perpetual continuance in perfect unity, St. John xiii. xvii. Hence we cannot reasonably question, but that in his infinite wisdom and boundless goodness, he has appointed the most proper means to bring all to the truth, and maintain them in unity. Now both reason and experience convince us, that the scrip-

ture alone, as interpreted by every private Christian, is not proper for these ends; but on the contrary, that the interpretation of scripture by private authority is the source of all errors and schisms. Therefore God never designed that the scripture, thus interpreted, should be our whole rule of faith, and only judge in controversies. He has left us besides the dead letter of scripture, a living judge, to be the perpetual guardian, and authentic interpreter of the scripture: a judge divinely recommended, and divinely assisted, whose voice all might hear and understand; on whom the most unlearned might securely rely, and to whom the most learned should be obliged to submit; whose sentence should be clear and decisive; and from whose sentence there should be no appeal. Now this ever living judge, is the ever living Church of God.

CHAPTER VIII.

APOSTOLICAL TRADITIONS.

St. Paul says, "Therefore brethren stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle," 2 Thess. ii. 15. Here St. Paul speaks plainly of unwritten traditions taught by the apostles, and gives them the same weight and authority as to his own epistle; because they convey to us the pure word of God as certainly, as scripture itself.

If you say that all tradition is uncertain, 1st, This is evidently to contradict St. Paul, who tells us, that the traditions of the apostles are to be held steadfastly. And must not every thinking man, who is not hurried away with prejudice, be of the same mind? For surely the word of God is equally the word of God, whether it be delivered to us by word of mouth, or by writing. Christ himself laid the foundation of the church by preaching only, and the apostles preached several years before they wrote any of the canonical books of scripture. Now I presume they preached the

pure word of God, and by consequence it was not their writing that made it the word of God, for it was the word of God before they wrote it: and though they had never written at all, but delivered the whole Christian doctrine only by word of mouth to those who succeeded them in their apostolical charge, we should have been obliged to receive it as the word of God, and therefore with the same respect as we do now the holy scripture. I add, that if apostolical tradition be necessarily uncertain, we cannot be sure of the scripture itself, which is conveyed to us by no other channel. And if the books of scripture can be infallibly conveyed to us by tradition from the apostles, why may not the Trinity or any other mystery of Christian faith? The reason in both cases is manifestly the same.

If you say 2dly, that all points of Christian doctrine were afterwards written in the Bible: I answer, 1. That the Bible no where says this. 2. That the church of all ages, from which we received the Bible itself, tells us the contrary. St. Irenæus, an eminent father and martyr of the second age:—"Suppose, (says he,) the apostles had left us no scriptures, ought we

not to have followed the rule of tradition, which they delivered to those, to whose care they committed the churches?" L. 3, c. 3.

"It is apostolical, (says St. Basil,) to hold even unwritten tradition:" L. de Sp. S. C. 29.

"Tradition too is necessary, (says St. Epiphanius;) for all things can not be had from the scripture. Therefore the blessed apostles left us some things in writing, and others by tradition:" Haer. 61.

St. Chrysostom agrees with them in the very same doctrine. "It is clear, (says he,) the apostles did not deliver all things in writing, but many things without it, and these too deserve to be believed. Let us then give credit to the traditions of the church. It is tradition, seek no further:" Hom. 4, in Ep. 2, ad Thess.

The word of God delivered to us by the tongues of men, is equal with the written word of God delivered to us by the pens of men. The apostles were equally men, whether they spoke or wrote. And I here ask any one, whether if St. Paul had instructed him in any point of the Christian doctrine only by word of mouth, he would not have believed it to be the word of God, and paid the same respect

to it, as if he had written it to him in a letter? This I fear is a puzzling question.

The observance of sanctifying the Sunday, is a thing necessary to be done, for which there is no express scripture; and we must depend on tradition of the church for the safety of this practice in setting aside the Saturday, and keeping the Sunday instead of it. All which put together, shows plainly, that there is no error in paying the same respect to apostolical traditions as to the scriptures themselves: because the apostles themselves taught nothing but the pure word of God; which whether it be written or not written, is equally an unerring rule both of faith and practice.

But Protestants produce five texts to prove that scripture contains all things necessary for men to believe or do. The four first are taken from Isa. viii. 20; John xx. 31; Gal. i. 8; and Eph. ii. 20. But they have so little connection with the matter they quote them for, that the four first verses of Genesis would be as much to his purpose. I appeal to the judgment of any man for the truth of what I say.

As to the fifth text it is thus quoted. "From

a child thou hast known the scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Jesus Christ, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. They ought to give also 15.

Now what were the holy scriptures which Timothy had known from a child? Doubtless the Old Testament only, for no part of the New Testament was then written. Either then the New Testament is not necessary to make a man wise unto salvation, or apostolical tradition may be also necessary.

In the 16th verse, St. Paul tells us, "That all scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, that the man of God may be perfect," &c. Of this no one doubts. But it is a quite different thing, to say the scripture is profitable or useful for such and such effects, and to say, the scripture alone is sufficient for them. Drink is profitable for perfect health and all functions of life in the best and most complete manner. But is there no need of meat? Again, meat is profitable for all the very same effects. But is there no need ot drink? I add that the scripture is even suffi-

cient for all the ends he mentions, when rightly understood, that is, by the lights to which the scripture itself directs us, (which lights are chiefly apostolical tradition, and the sense of the church,) or when a man has learned from the pastors of the church the tenets of Christian doctrine. Then the scripture will furnish him abundantly both with examples and moral instructions for all Christian virtues.

What the whole church holds, not instituted by councils, but always kept, is very rightly believed to be handed down only by apostolic authority. They who were before us in the church have kept the doctrine which there they found; there they taught what they learnt, have left to their children what they received by tradition from their forefathers. Quod invenerunt in ecclesia, tenuerunt; quod didiscerunt, docuerunt; quod a patribus acceperunt, hoc filiis tradiderunt. Aug. contra Julianum, Lib. 2, cap. 10. What they found in the church they retained; what they learned they taught, what they received from their ancestors this they delivered to their children.

The second Council of Nice defines thus:

"Whoever shall dare to think otherwise, or teach after the custom of wicked heretics, to violate ecclesiastical traditions, let him be anathemas." Act 7, p. 686. Anno Dom. 781. The Council of Sens, thus: "It is a dangerous thing to be in that error, that nothing ought to be admitted which is not in scripture; for many things were delivered from Christ to posterity by the hands of the apostles, from mouth to mouth, &c. which are to be held without doubt." Decret. 5.

CHAPTER IX.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

ANOTHER property of the true church of Christ is, "a succession from the apostles of Christ." This is signified in the Nicene Creed, by the word apostolic or apostolical, when we therefore profess that we "believe the one, Catholic, and apostolic church." And it must be evident beyond dispute, since the apostles were by Christ's commission, the first fathers and founders of the church; and with them and their successors, both Christ himself and his Holy Spirit were to remain to the end of the world. St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, and St. John xiv. 16, 17, compared with Isaiah lix. 20, 21, that the true church can be no other than that which has a "succession from the apostles."

This apostolical succession, which is an inseparable property of the true church, implies four things, viz. 1st, A succession of a church, that is of a society, or communication, descending without interruption from that first society or communion established by the

apostles. 2dly, A succession of doctrine derived in an uninterrupted channel from the apostles. 3dly, A succession of holy orders, derived from those who were ordained by the apostles. 4thly, A succession of lawful commission, or spiritual jurisdiction and authority to preach, administer the sacraments, and execute all other branches of the pastoral office, which Christ gave to his apostles, St. Matt. xxviii. 19, and St. John xx. 21, and they imparted to their followers, the ministers of the church, lawfully called, and lawfully sent for, that this branch of succession is different from the bare succession of holy orders, is visible; for bishops and priests truly ordained, when by heresy and schism they fall from the church, have true orders after their fall, because they cannot lose their character, but have no lawful commission or spiritual jurisdiction; for this no heretic or schismatic either has himself, or can impart to others, having forfeited it by his revolt.

Hence, for a church to be truly apostolical, or to have a "succession from the apostles," it is not enough that the bishops and priests of this church have holy orders derived from

the apostles; for so the Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and many other heretics have had; nor is it enough that with their orders they have also retained the doctrine of the apostles, as many schismatics have done, especially in the beginning of their schism; but it is requisite moreover, that the society which would claim the title of apostolical, be not a new raised communion, separated from that great body of christians which descends in an uninterrupted channel from the apostles; and that its ministers act by lawful commission, derived from that which was first given by Christ to the apostles; for where these things are wanting there can be no true church of Christ, but a sect, or schism, and consequently a synagogue of antichrist.

All these four parts of apostolical succession have been evidently promised in the scriptures to the true church of Christ. 1. A succession of a society or communion ever standing, and ever flourishing till time itself should end, St. Matt. xvi. 18, St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. St. Luke i. 32, St. John xiv. 16, 17, Psal. lxxii. 5, 7, Psal. lxxxix. 27, &c., Isaiah liv. 9, 10, Daniel ii. 31, 44, &c. 2.

A succession of orthodox doctrine in this same society or communion from the time of Christ and his apostles to the end of the world; for which see the same texts; as also, Isaiah lix. 20, 21, Ephes. iv. 11, 12, &c. 3. A succession of pastors lawfully ordained, Jer. xxxiii. 17, &c. See also St. John xx. 22, 23, compared with St. Matt. xxviii. 20. 4. A succession of spiritual jurisdiction and authority to execute all the functions of the ministry; given to the apostles for them and their successors, St. John xx. 21, and St. Matt. xxiii. 18, 19, 20, without which whosoever comes is to be looked upon as an usurper, a thief and a robber, St. John x. 11, Heb. v. 1, 4. St. John x. 1.

It remains that we should examine which of the two, the old or the new religion, bids the fairest for all these four branches of apostolical succession, and consequently the title of apostolical church.

And first, it is evident that none of the modern sects of pretenders to reformation can claim any succession of their society or communion from the days of the apostles, because it is notorious to all the world that their reli-

gion began with what they call the reformation, and that they are a new raised communion formed by going out from us; now where there is a new raised communion and a change of religion, it is evident there can be no such thing as perpetual succession in the same communion and the same religion. In a word, there were no such thing as Protestants, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Calvinists, or by what other name you please to call them, 330 years ago, nor had been for 1517 years; therefore they cannot pretend to an uninterrupted succession of their communion from the apostles. The consequence of which is, that none of them all can have any just claim, either to the scriptures or to any other part of the apostolical inheritance, because they descended not from the apostles, and consequently are not the right heirs of the apostles, but an upstart race, that have no connexion with the apostles.

2dly. It is no less evident that neither Protestants, nor any other modern sectaries have any succession of their doctrine from the apostles. I speak not of that part of their doctrine, in which they agree with Catholics,

which is certainly apostolical; but of that part of their own doctrine which is peculiar to themselves, and from which they are denominated Protestants, &c. For it is notorious to the whole world, that before the year 1517, there was not any where upon earth a set of men that held throughout the same protestancy, that is, the same protesting articles, as are now taught by any modern sectaries, of what denomination soever.

3dly. As for succession of holy orders, the greatest part of modern sectaries have not the least claim to it, because they have no bishops descending by succession from the apostles, and consequently can have no orders derived from them. For it is the universal tradition of all churches from the very time of the apostles, that none are to be acknowledged for lawful ministers of the word, or sacraments of Christ, but those who were ordained by the apostles, or the bishops of the church descending from them. Hence the Lutheran superintendents, the Calvinian presbyters, &c., who are no bishops, nor ever received holy orders from any that were true bishops, are indeed no better than mere lay-

men, not only in the judgment of all churches, whether catholic or schismatical, for fifteen hundred years after Christ, but even in the judgment of the best divines of the Protestant congregations abroad, as well as those of the dissenters at home, are indeed no churches, and if lay baptism, as many Protestant divines will have it, be no baptism, they are no Christians. Whether the English Protestant clergy be in any better condition, we will examine in another place.

4thly. As to the most essential branch of apostolical succession, viz: that of mission or commission and authority, given by Christ to his apostles, and derived in an uninterrupted channel from them, for preaching the word. administering the sacraments, &c.—It is what all sectaries have most certainly forfeited, from the moment they separated themselves from that great body of Christians which descends in one communion from the apostles, with which alone the apostles deposited their commission, and whose pastors alone are the undoubted heirs of the apostles. For what claim can sectaries have to any mission or spiritual power derived from the apostles through the

channel of the church, who at their very first setting out broke off from this channel; that is, from the communion of the same church to which they pretended to appeal for their commission and succession, and were excommunicated by her chief pastors? which was certainly the case with all the first reformers.

To set this matter in a clearer light, it must be observed that all spiritual power, jurisdiction and authority must come from God, and cannot be executed without a criminal presumption and usurpation any otherwise than by commission from him; so that whosoever intrudes himself by his own appointment into the pastoral office, or spiritual functions, in the language of the scripture, is a thief and a robber. St. John x. 1. Now, there are but two ways that this divine commission, (without which it would be high treason against God to usurp the office or functions of his delegates and ministers,) can be imparted to any person, viz., either immediately by God himself, as he sent Moses and the prophets in the Old Testament, and Christ and his apostles in the New: or else, by being licensed and empowered by men who have that authority

handed down to them from those who were originally commissioned by God, of which kind is the mission of all the ordinary pastors of the church of Christ, deriving both their orders and their jurisdiction from the apostles, who were commissioned by Christ himself, with a promise to abide with them and their successors for ever. St. Matthew xxviii. 19, 20.

As for that extraordinary mission immediately from God himself, though some modern sectaries have pretended to it, yet none of them could ever yet produce the necessary proofs to justify their pretensions; none of them could ever show their patents stamped with the broad seal of heaven; that is, none of them could ever work any evident miracle in testimony of their being sent by God, which nevertheless was absolutely necessary for any prudent Christian to receive them as God's extraordinary delegates immediately sent from him. For God, who is the sovereign wisdom and the sovereign justice, does not expect that we should receive any as immediately sent from him upon their bare assertion; otherwise we should be daily exposed to the dan-

ger of receiving false prophets, wolves in sheep's clothing, who never fail to cry out, The Lord, the Lord, though the Lord never sent them. From whence we have a right to conclude that such as cannot produce sufficient proofs of their being sent in an extraordinary manner immediately from God himself, were indeed never sent by him; since God's sending his delegates necessarily implies an obligation in men to receive those whom he sends, which obligation can never be where these pretended delegates cannot produce their credentials. Hence Christ himself declares that the Jews would not have sinned in not receiving him, "if he had not done such works amongst them, as no one else had done," St. John xv. 24. So necessary it is that the pretensions to an extraordinary mission should be supported by such extraordinary proofs as neither ancient nor modern sectaries could ever yet produce.

And if we have a right to call for these extraordinary proofs as often as any one pretends to an extraordinary mission from God, how much more in the case of modern sectaries, whose enterprise was so extraordinary? For what they made profession of was nothing

less than altering the whole face of God's church ; reforming, as they called it, her faith, abolishing her liturgy, degrading her ministry, setting aside her canons and discipline, condemning the doctrinal decisions of her general councils, preaching down her most ancient traditions, and entirely disclaiming her authority. Now, to support them in this enterprise against the whole visible church, founded by the miracles of Christ, and all her ordinary pastors, descending by succession from the apostles of Christ, they had so much the more need of miracles, as they had neither any predictions of the prophets to recommend them, nor any extraordinary sanctity of life and conversation to plead for them; and on the other hand, they had against them the authority of the whole visible church, so strongly established by innumerable texts of scripture that if there be any thing evident in scripture, this their enterprise against the church was evidently unwarrantable, not to say impious and sacrilegious.

And as for their appealing, as some of them have done, to the miracles of Christ, to justify their proceedings against the church, no-

thing could be more absurd; since it must be evident to every thinking man, that his miracles bear testimony, indeed, to the society established by him and his apostles, but not to any new raised communion, cut off from the original succession; and that in the dispute between the old church and modern sectaries, concerning the meaning and interpretation of the scriptures, which is the main subject of all our contests, not one of the miracles of Christ can, with any show of probability, be alleged against that interpretation of God's word, which the church gives; but rather all of them in favour of her, to whose teachers that same word has evidently promised the Spirit of Truth, St. John xiv. 16, 17; and the presence and assistance of Christ himself, till the end of the world. St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

But the greatest part of modern sectaries being sensible that they can have no pretensions to any extraordinary mission immediately from God himself, would willingly put in for some share in the ordinary vocation of God's ministers, derived through the channel of the church. But they are as little able to main-

tain this claim as the other. For if they were not sent immediately from God himself, but by the ministry of men, who by succession had inherited this divine commission, it is incumbent on them to declare who those men were that imparted this commission to their first teachers. Who sent them to teach their Protestant doctrine? Who authorized them to preach down and alter at pleasure, in spite of all the ordinary pastors, the doctrine, discipline, liturgy, traditions, ordinances and observances of the whole visible church? It is plain they did not receive this commission from the hands of others, more ancient sectaries; who neither had any such commission to impart, nor if they had, did any of the first reformers so much as pretend to be sent by them. And it is ridiculous to say they received this commission from the Catholic church, which never commissioned any to preach a doctrine anathematized by all her pastors; nor could their receiving orders in the Catholic communion authorize them to commence teachers of another religion. Besides, if the system of these reformers be true, their orders, which they received in the Catholic church, were

derived from antichrist, and given by heretics and idolators, who by their apostacy from the gospel had forfeited the apostolical commission for themselves, and consequently could not impart it to others. It follows, therefore, that these gentlemen have intruded themselves into the pastoral ministry without being sent by any one but by him that sent all the false prophets from the beginning. For, as for a mission from the laity, which some of them have pretended to, these have none themselves, and therefore could impart none.

Here, perhaps, some may appeal to the Albegeois, the Vaudois, Wickliff, Huss, &c., and pretend to an apostolical succession through this channel, but in vain. First, because none of all these had any branch of apostolical succession themselves, and were as much put to it as modern sectaries are to tell who sent them. 2dly, because all these, in many substantial articles, differed from modern Protestants; as Monsieur Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, has demonstrated in his 11th Book of the History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches. 3dly, because, if we were even to suppose that any of these had a suc-

cession from the apostles, it is visible that modern sectaries had no succession from them, since they do not so much as pretend to have derived their orders or mission from any bishops of the Albegeois, Vaudois, Wickliff or Hussites; and it may be questioned if any of these sectaries ever had any such thing as true bishops.

From all that has been said, it is evident that modern sectaries have no share in any branch of apostolical succession; since neither their church nor their doctrine, their orders nor their mission, are derived from the apostles of Christ. It is plain that the Catholic church had no other beginning but from the apostles of Christ; and that the present church in communion with Rome, visibly descends from that first society established by Christ and the apostles without any breach or interruption.

CHAPTER X.

CATHOLIC RULE OF FAITH AND JUDGE OF CONTROVERSIES.

THE Catholic rule of faith is the word of God, written or unwritten, as proposed and interpreted by the church of God; and the Catholic judge of controversies is the church of God. Now, of all the ways that can be proposed for the coming at the truth in matters controverted among Christians, this Catholic way of following the church's interpretation of God's word, and adhering to her doctrine and decisions in all disputes, is evidently the safest, the most prudent, the most agreeable to Christian humility, and the best adapted for maintaining unity.

All other ways, instead of affording any assurance of a Christian being in the right in his way of thinking, with regard to religious controversies and the interpretation of scripture, leave him under an absolute uncertainty. Thus, for instance, private judgment alone can give no certainty or security in these cases, which being controverted matters, are disputed

between learned men on both sides; and nothing but self-conceit can make any one man depend so much upon his own private judgment, as to pretend to a certainty and evidence which so many others, every way as well qualified as himself, cannot see. For what helps has he for understanding scriptures and deciding controversies which others of a contrary persuasion have not? or what greater security has he than they against the influence of education, and all the subtleties and deceits of self-love?

The private spirit, which some pretend to, can afford no greater assurance. For what certainty can they have (especially when they oppose the church of God) that this spirit which moves them is the Spirit of God, and not their own imagination, or the spirit of darkness, transforming himself into an angel of light? Nor must they conclude themselves to be secure against the illusions either of their own imagination or of a diabolical spirit, because they flatter themselves that their lives are regular, and that this spirit by which they are actuated moves them not to anything that to them appears evil; for as to the regularity

of their lives, there are many others every way as regular as themselves, and no less pretending to the Spirit, who have quite a different way of thinking, and consequently one or the other, notwithstanding the regularity of their lives, is certainly led by a false spirit, since they condemn one another. And as for their alleging that their spirit moves them to nothing that is evil, they do not consider that it is the greatest of all evils to be filled with proud conceit of themselves; to withdraw themselves from the authority of church guides established by Christ, and from the beaten road of the saints, and to go astray into the by-paths of singularity and error; and that by these evil fruits they ought to judge that their spirit must be an evil one: that of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram was an evil spirit, because it was a spirit of pride and disobedience; and as the spirit of the false prophets and false apostles, who have been from the beginning, is demonstrated to have been an evil spirit, by its disagreeing with the spirit and doctrine of the true church, guides of divine appointment. By which rule we are commanded to try the spirits. 1 St. John iv. 6.

He that knoweth God, heareth us, (the pastors of the church:) he that is not of God, heareth not us; by this we know the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error.

And as neither private judgment nor the private spirit can afford any certainty in controversies of religion, or any security in opposing the public authority and decision of the church, so neither can any lesser authority, as that of any particular minister, doctor or bishop, or of any particular congregation, or even of a national church, be of any weight, when put in scales, against the greater authority of a general council, or of the whole church. Because the greater authority must needs weigh down the less. And whatever may be alleged in favour of the less, as to piety, learning, study of the scripture, &c., will be found with advantage in the greater. So that, as it would be rashness, pride, and self-conceit in any one to prefer his own private judgment and interpretation of scripture to that of the whole church, so it would be the height of imprudence to prefer the lesser authority of any private teacher, congregation or nation to the far greater authority of the

Catholic church, and the interpretation of the scripture which she delivers.

From whence it follows, that the way which Catholics take in all matters of controversy, and in all disputes concerning the interpretation of scripture, viz: to stand by the decision of the great body of church guides, descending from the apostles, is evidently the safest and most prudent. The same is visibly the most agreeable to Christian humility, and that submission which the word of God requires from the faithful to their prelates and pastors, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, and to casting down imaginations, and to bringing into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ, of which the apostle speaks, 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. And that this is the only way by which church unity can be maintained both reason and daily experience clearly demonstrate. Besides which considerations, I shall offer the following arguments in favour of the Catholic system.

1. The Catholic church alone is duly qualified to be the interpreter of God's word; because as she, and no other church, has always subsisted from Christ to this day, so it was

she and no other that first received the scriptures from the apostles of Christ, and saw them from the beginning truly interpreted by the preaching and by the lives of those first planters of the gospel, and by the practice of primitive Christians; and has been from that time to this, in a constant and uninterrupted possession of those divine truths thus expounded and delivered, which is what no other society of men can pretend to. Therefore as it is plain that no one could be better qualified than the church of the first Christians, (which had received the interpretation of the scriptures from the apostles,) to teach the succeeding generation the true sense and meaning of the scriptures, so it is equally plain no one could be better qualified than the church of the succeeding generation to teach their immediate followers and successors; and so from father to son to this day. And thus it is easily understood how a church that has subsisted in all ages, and which originally received both the scriptures and the interpretation of them from the apostles, should be to this day the best qualified for delivering the true meaning of them to her children. But the

same cannot be said of any church or congregation which has no claim to any such uninterrupted possession of the divine scriptures, and which loudly professes that the interpretation which she gives of them was lost for many hundred years.

2. The Catholic or universal church is not only the best qualified to interpret the word of God, because she alone has originally received the interpretation of it from the apostles; but also much more, because she alone has a claim to the Spirit of Truth promised to abide with her pastors for ever, St. John xiv. 16, 17; to teach them all things, v. 26, and to guide them into all truth, chap. xvi. 13. She is the pillar and ground of truth, 1 Tim. iii. 15. She is built upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, St. Matt. xvi. 18. To her pastors teaching all nations Christ has promised his presence and assistance, always even till the end of the world, St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. To these he has promised that his spirit shall never be taken from them; and that his words (the pure profession of all his divine truths) shall never depart from their mouth, Isai. lix. 20,

21. He that heareth not these is to be looked upon as a heathen and a publican, St. Matt. xviii. 17. These are given by Christ, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, &c. that we may not be like children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, who is the head, even Christ, Ephes. iv. 11, 12, &c. Therefore the church, in her pastors, is by divine commission the guardian of all heavenly truths, the authentic interpreter of the scripture, and the living judge of all religious controveries.

3. The Catholic way of having all religious controversies decided without appeal by the tribunal of the pastors of the church, was certainly the method appointed by God in the old law, Deut. xvii. 8, 9, &c. approved by Christ our Lord, St. Matt. xxiii. 2 and 3, practised by the apostles, Acts xv. and ever followed by the church of God from the beginning: which has in every age condemned sectaries by the scriptures as she understood them, and never allowed them to appeal from

her sentence to the dead letter of the Bible, or their own interpretation of it.

4. Modern sectaries receive the scriptures themselves upon the testimony of the Catholic church. Why do they not receive the interpretation of them from the same hand from which they received the books? They receive the epistle to the Hebrews, the Revelations, and some other parts of the scripture formerly controverted, upon the decision of the church: why do they not equally stand to her judgment in other religious controversies? If she was infallible in deciding that those books are scripture, why not in other matters relating to faith? If she was not infallible in deciding that those books are scripture, how came they to receive them for the infallible word of God?

CHAPTER XI.

SALVATION ONLY IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The true church of Christ is the fold of Christ, which, as we learn from John x. 16, can be but one, and all his sheep must be brought to this fold, that so there may be one fold and one shepherd. Ibid. Therefore they that die out of the church of Christ, are not his sheep.

The true church of Christ is the kingdom of Christ, in which he lives and reigns for ever. Dan. ii. 44; Luke i. 33. She is the city of the living God, the spiritual Sion which the Lord hath chosen for his habitation for ever. Ps. cxxxii. 14, 15. She is the true temple of the Most High, prefigured by the tabernacle of the testimony and the temple of Jerusalem, in which alone the children of Israel were to offer their sacrifices, Deut. xii. 5, 11, 13, 14, to signify that in the church alone prayer or sacrifice should be accepted. She is the house of God, 1 Tim. iii. 15, built by the wisest of all architects, upon the strongest

of all rocks, proof against all floods and storms, Matt. vii. 24, 25; xvi. 18. That one house in which alone the lamb was to be eaten, Exod. xii. 46, out of which no part of the flesh was to be carried. Ibid. So that they who belong not to this house have no share in the flesh of the Lamb, which they cannot eat but to their own condemnation. Can they belong to Christ who are no part of his kingdom; who are not in his city; who have no place in his temple; who are strangers to his house? And is not this the unhappy case of all those who are out of the true church, which alone, according to the scripture, is the kingdom, the city, the temple and the house of Christ?

The true church of Christ is the only spouse of Christ, joined to him by an indissoluble union of which Christian matrimony is a mysterious representation. Eph. iv. 31, 32. They cannot, therefore, have Christ for their father who have not the church for their mother.

The true church of Christ is the body, of which he is the head. Col. i. 18; Eph. v. 23. Of which he is the Saviour. Ibid. Therefore

they who are not in the true church of Christ, are not part of his mystical body, and consequently have no share in his Spirit, which is not to be found out of his body. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Rom. viii. 9.

The true church of Christ is the camp of the saints, the beloved city. Rev. xx. 9. Christ walks in the midst of her candlesticks, and holds her stars (that is, her prelates, Rev. i. 20,) in his right hand. Rev. ii. 1. She is the garden enclosed, the fountain sealed. Song of Solomon, iv. 12. She is a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, even the people of God. 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10. Those who have no share in Christ's church, have no part in all this happiness.

To the children of the true church of Christ St. Paul cries out, Heb. xii. 22, 23, 24, You are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men

made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel. This is that communion of saints which is joined in the creed to the holy Catholic church; the benefit of which communion is forfeited by all those that renounce the fellowship of the true church of Christ. To forsake her is to forsake Christ, who has promised to be always with her. Matt. xxviii. 20. It is to forsake the Holy Ghost, her invisible director. Is. lix. 21; John xiv. 16, 26; xvi. 13. Out of her no remission of sins, nor happy resurrection, both the one and the other are annexed in the creed itself to the true church. Out of her no power of the keys for forgiving or retaining of sins, which was given only to her pastors. Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23. She is the ark built by divine appointment against the waters of the deluge, out of which whosoever is found will perish in the flood.

To stand separate from the faith of the true church, is the crime of heresy of which St. Paul says, Gal. v. 20, 21, they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

To be voluntarily separated from the communion of the church, is the crime of schism, allowed by all to be a damnable sin, and which, as the holy fathers unanimously declare, cannot even be expiated with shedding one's blood for Christ. To oppose the authority of the true church, and her governors established by Christ, is a heinous crime of spiritual rebellion; the very crime for which, by a dreadful judgment, Korah, Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up alive by the earth. Num. xvi. To be obstinately disobedient to the church guides is to despise Christ. Luke x. 16. It is in vain, therefore, for those who remain voluntarily out of the true church, to pretend to be innocent. They may be so with regard to murder, adultery, theft, and the like. But not with regard to the crimes of heresy and schism.

There is no salvation without faith in Christ. This is taught so clearly, and in so many places in the New Testament, that a person must in effect renounce Christianity, who presumes to question the truth of it. Mark xvi. 16. He that believeth not shall be damned. John iii. 14, 15. As Moses lifted up the ser-

pent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth not is already condemned, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. John viii. 24. If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins. John xvii. 3. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. Acts iv. 12. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved. Heb. x. 6. Without faith it is impossible to please God. John iii. 36. He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

But what need of quoting so many single texts for proving a truth which St. Paul himself has proved at large in two whole epistles, viz: that to the Romans and that to the Galatians, where the apostle makes it the main business to show, 1. That both Jews and Gentiles, antecedently to faith in Christ, are all under sin. Rom. iii. 9; Gal. iii. 22. 2. That they cannot be justified either by the works of the law of nature, or the law of

Moses. Rom. iv., &c.; Gal. iii. &c. 3. That the justice of God is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference, all have sinned—being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. Rom. iii. 22, &c.

Therefore moral honesty alone is not sufficient for any man's salvation. This, indeed, may be found amongst Heathens, Mahometans and Jews; but this is, at the most, but only one branch of our duty. Our chief obligation is that which regards the worship of God, and the theological virtues of faith, hope and love of God above all things, which few Christians think enough of, and to which those that know not Christ never pretend to aspire. And truly, if moral honesty alone were enough for any man's justification and salvation, then, as St. Paul argues, Gal. ii. 21, Christ is dead in vain; since, independently of his death, men might, through the law of nature or of Moses, attain to moral honesty, and thereby to justification and salvation.

It was then with very good reason that our

English Protestants in the 18th of the Thirty-nine Articles, to which all their clergy are obliged to subscribe, have declared that those are to be accursed who presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature; for the holy scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved. It was with very good reason that Luther, in his lesser confession, (apud Hospinian, p. 2, b. 187,) declaimed most zealously against Zuinglius, so far as even to declare that he despaired of his salvation, because he had given a place among the blessed souls to impious pagans. "For what signifies our baptism, says he, or the other sacraments; what does the scripture or Jesus Christ himself avail us, if impious men, if idolators and epicureans are saints?" So far Luther.

In order to salvation, we must either in effect be members of the true church of Christ, or at least in the unfeigned disposition of the heart's desire, and seek to be so.

This is proved from Matt. xviii. 17; if he

neglect to hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican. Luke xiii. 16. He that heareth you (the pastors of the true church) heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me. Now how can he be in a state of salvation, who despiseth Christ and his Father?

Heb. xi. 6. Without faith it is impossible to please God. And Mark xvi. 16. He that believeth not, shall be damned. So that true faith is necessary to salvation. Now true faith, in order to please God and save our souls, must be entire, and must believe without exception, all such articles as are duly proposed to be believed; and he that voluntarily and obstinately disbelieveth any one of these articles, is no less void of true saving faith, than he that disbelieves them all. As St. James tells us, in regard to practical duties, chap. ii. 10. Whosoever shall keep the whole law, yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.

3. Gal. v. 20. Where St. Paul reckons heresies, or sects, among the works of the flesh, of which he tells us, v. 21, They

which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

4. Because, in the old law, an obstinate refusal of obedience to the ministers of the synagogue in legal controversies, was a crime to be punished with death. Deut. xvii. 12, 13. The man that will do presumptuously and will not hearken to the priest, (that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God,) or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel. And all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously. Can it be a less crime to refuse to hear the church of Christ?

5. Because we read, Acts ii. 47, that the Lord added daily to the church such as should be saved. Nor does the scripture point out to us any other way of salvation.

6. Because of the church it is written, Is. liv. 15, Whosoever shall gather together against thee shall fall for thy sake. V. 17, Every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn. And Is. lx. 12, The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish.

The same appears from the manner in

which dissenters from the church of Christ are treated in the New Testament. Rom. xvi. 17, 18:—I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them, for they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. Gal. i. 8, 9:—Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed. Titus iii. 10, 11:—A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject, knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself. 2 Peter ii. 1, 2:—There will be lying masters, who cunningly will introduce damnable heresies, and bring upon themselves swift perdition, and many will follow their pernicious ways. Hence St. Jude, v. 13, calls heretics, raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame, to whom is reserved the black-

ness of darkness for ever. And St. John calls them Antichrists, that is, adversaries and enemies of Christ, 1 John ii. 18. Antiquity always looked upon heretics and schismatics as persons out of the way of salvation.

In every age, since the apostles' time, Christendom has been divided by many different sects; of which some have had great numbers of followers, so as to be for a while the prevailing religion in some nations, as the Montanists in Phrygia, (who called themselves the churches of Phrygia, Tertul. L. contra Phrax,) the Donatists in Africa, the Arians in several parts of the East, during the times of the emperors Constantius and Valens, and afterwards amongst the Goths, Vandals, &c. Some of which sects never called into question any of those articles of the Christian doctrine, which Protestants call fundamentals; as neither the Montanists, nor the Donatists did, to whom we may join the Novatians, the Quartodecimans, the Apollinarists, &c.; all which, notwithstanding, the Holy Fathers unanimously agree in denying the followers of these sects to be any part of Christ's church on earth, or

to have any share of his church in heaven; witness,

1. St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, and Martyr, disciple of the apostles, in his genuine epistle to the Philippians; where he declares, that whosoever follows those that make a separation, or a separate communion, shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Could this be said, if separated communions might still be parts of the true church of Christ?

2. St. Irenæus, bishop, and Martyr, in his first book against heresies, chap. iii. where he says, that the church, having received this preaching and this faith, (he speaks of the pure and orthodox preaching and faith received from the apostles,) though she be spread through the whole world, keeps it with great care, as dwelling in one house; and believes alike these things, as having but one soul: and one and the same heart: And with one voice preaches, teaches, and delivers these things, as having but one mouth. Behold here the whole church of God described by this primitive father, as dwelling in one house, having but one heart, one soul, and one mouth. Could he have expressed in stronger

terms, the church's being but in one communion, and having but one faith, and one doctrine? And if you would know what he thought of those who were divided from the faith and communion of this one church, hearken to what he says, L. 3, c. 4. She (the church) is the gate of life, but all the rest, that is all other sects separated from her communion, are thieves and robbers, and therefore to be avoided.

3. St. Clement of Alexandria, L.7, Strom. p. 764, 765. "From what has been said (against all heretics) I take it," says he, "to be manifest, that there is but one true church, the same which is ancient indeed: into which the just, according to God's purpose, are enrolled. For, as there is but one God, and one Lord, so whatsoever is highly venerable, has its praise from being an imitation of that first principle, which is but one. The church therefore is made partaker of the nature of unity, being but one, which heresies strive to divide into many. We do therefore affirm, that the ancient and Catholic church is but one, in her substance, in her idea or proper notion, in her origin, and in her excellence. But as

for heresies, some are called from the proper names of men, as those which have their denomination from Valentine and Marcion, Basilides—others from some nation, as the heresy of the Phrygians (the Montanists); others from their actions, as the Encratites; others from their peculiar doctrine, as the Docites, &c.," where he plainly supposes all these, and all other sects, which are known by their several denominations, distinct from that of Christian and Catholic, to be no part of that one church of which he had been speaking, and which, he says, is no other than the old church.

4. St. Cyprian maintains the same doctrine at large in his whole book of the Unity of the Church. Let the reader in particular remark these words. "There is but one God, and one Christ, and one church, and one faith, and a people joined into one solid body with the glue of concord. This unity cannot suffer division; nor this one body bear to be disjointed and torn to pieces." He adds, that to "leave this original unity, is to forfeit life, and renounce salvation." And in his 76th Epistle to Magnus, he says, "the church is one, which being but one, cannot both be

within doors and without. If the church be with Novatian, she could not be in the communion of Cornelius; but if she was in Cornelius' communion, Novatian (who is separated from that communion) is not in the church; for, that the church cannot be without doors, nor suffer a breach or division of communion; but always keeps the unity of an inseparable and individual house, the faith of the divine scripture demonstrates," &c. Can this doctrine be reconciled with that scheme which makes the church a compound of many different sects and communions?

5. St. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, predecessor to St. Athanasius, in his epistle to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, recorded by Theodoret, L. 1, Hist. c. 4. "We confess one, and only one Catholic, apostolic church, never to be beat down, though the whole world should war against her, and always victorious against the most impious enterprises of heretics." Could this be said of a church, which is compounded of catholics and heretics?

6. Lactantius, in his fourth book of Divine Institutions, p. 231, 232, Cantab. Anno 1685.

"Because many heresies have risen, and by the instigation of evil spirits, God's people have been divided into diverse sects; we must declare, in few words, where the truth is to be found, and point out the place where she dwells; to the end that if any one desires the water of life, he may not go to seek it in broken cisterns which have no spring, but being acquainted with the plenteous fountain of God's truth, he may there find an everlasting source of light. When certain societies are called by the name of Phrygians, Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Anthrapians, or Arians, or any such like denominations, know that these have ceased to be Christians; since, leaving the name of Christ, they have adopted foreign names. It is then the Catholic church alone which retains the true worship. —She is the fountain of truth, the house of faith, the temple of God, into which whosoever shall not enter, or out of which whosoever shall depart, can have no hope of everlasting life and salvation. No man must here flatter himself by an obstinate contention; for nothing less than life and salvation is at stake." So far this Christian orator, who

flourished in the time of Dioclesian and Constantine the Great; and who in these words visibly excludes from any part in the church, all sects commonly known by their peculiar denominations, and amongst these the Novatians by name, whose capital error consisted in taking away confession and penance, an error which Protestants will not allow to be fundamental. Hence, immediately after the words above quoted, he gives this rule for knowing the true church.—The true church is that, in which is confession and penance.

7. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 18, Illumin., explaining those words of the creed, the one Holy Catholic Church, in such a manner as to exclude all sectaries. See also St. Hilary, in his seventh book of the Trinity, No. 4, declaring, that there is but one church founded by God, established by the apostles, from which all erring sects are cut off.

8. St. Pacian, in his first epistle to Sempronian, the Novatian, plainly excludes all sectaries, and amongst the rest, by name, the Montanists, Novatians, and Apollinarists, from any part in the church, which he calls the spotless Virgin, &c. He adds, Christian is

my name, Catholic is my surname. By this name of Catholic, our society is distinguished from all heresies.

9. St. Cyprian, Ep. 62, (in the Oxford edition, Ep. 4, p. 175.) "The house of God is but one, and no one can have salvation but in the church." And in his book of the Unity of the Church, p. 109, &c. "He cannot have God for his father, who has not the church for his mother. If any one could escape, who was out of the ark of Noah, then he who is out of the church may also escape. This stain is not even washed off with man's blood. Such a one may be put to death for religion, but he cannot be crowned."

10. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. I. in Pascha. "We know that salvation belongs to the church alone, and that no one can partake of Christ, nor be saved, out of the Catholic church, and Catholic faith."

11. St. Augustine, Ep. 209, to Felicia: "In the Catholic church there are both good and bad. But those that are separated from her, as long as their opinions are opposite to hers, cannot be good. For though the conversation of some of them appears commend-

able, yet their very separation from the church, makes them bad, according to that of our Saviour, Luke, xi. 23. "He who is not with me is against me, and he who gathers not with me, scatters."

12. St. Fulgentius, in his first book of Remission of Sins, c. 22. "As in Jericho, no one could save his life, who was not in the house of Rahab; so out of the Catholic church, no one shall obtain pardon of his sins." And in his book of Faith, c. 37, "Hold most firmly and without any doubt, that no one, who is baptized out of the Catholic church, can partake of eternal life, if before the end of this life he be not restored to the Catholic church, and incorporated therein."

Pro. 16, 25. "There is a way that seemeth right unto man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Matt. xv. 14. "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." John xvi. 2. "The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth God service." And will this erroneous conscience excuse such persecutor? No certainly; no more than the Jews that crucified Christ, of whom St. Peter says, Acts iii. 17,

"I know that through ignorance you did it, as did also your rulers." 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." St. Jerome, in his 57th Epistle to Pope Damasus, says: "I am joined in communion with your holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter, upon that rock I know the church is built. Whoever eats the lamb out of this house, is profane; whoever is not in this ark, shall perish by the waters of the deluge," &c. Now could this be said, if the church of Christ might be in more than one communion? The same St. Jerome, in the end of his dialogue against the Lucifrian schismatics, delivers himself thus. To tell you briefly and plainly the sentiments of my soul, we must live and die in that church, which, having been founded by the apostles subsists to this day. But if in any place you hear some that are called Christians, taking a name, not from our Lord Jesus Christ, but some other, as Marcionites, Valentinians, Mountaineers, or Field Conventicles, (Montenses Campenses,) know that such are no church of Christ, but a synagogue of antichrist. Nor let them flatter themselves,

that they quote the scriptures for their tenets, since the devil also quoted scripture, which consists not in the reading, but in the right understanding.

St. Augustine, in his book on the Unity of the Church, c. 4, lays down this general rule, agreeable to the notions of all antiquity. Whosoever, says he, believe the incarnation, passion, resurrection and divinity of Jesus Christ, &c., yet dissent from his body, which is the church, in such a manner that their communion is not with the whole, wheresoever it is spread, but found only in some part separate from the whole, it is evident that such are not in the Catholic church. And in his 48th Epistle to Vincentius, making the application of this rule to the Donatists: you are with us, says he, in baptism, in the creed, in the rest of the sacraments of our Lord, but in the spirit of unity, and in the bond of peace, in short, in the Catholic church you are not with us. Hence the Council of Nice, in the 8th Canon, evidently supposes the Novatians to have been no part of the Catholic church. All, therefore, excommunicated persons, (as Protestants are,) have no part in the church of Christ if he has power to excommunicate.

CHAPTER XII.

HOLY ORDERS.

St. Paul, speaking to the bishops of the church, says, "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God," Acts xx. 28. The same apostle, writing to Timothy, whom he had appointed bishop of Ephesus, 1 Tim. i. 3, says, "against a priest receive not an accusation, but under two or three witnesses," 1 Tim. v. 19; St. Timothy had authority and jurisdiction over the priests in receiving accusations against them, and consequently in judging and correcting them. In like manner, in writing to Titus, he says, "for this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee," Tit. i. 5. From the earliest ages, whenever a bishop was consecrated, a certain portion of the faithful was assigned to him for his particular charge as their pastor; and the place where this charge was given him was

called his Diocese; thus, Titus was ordained by St. Paul to be bishop of Crete, and Timothy to be bishop of Ephesus. In these dioceses they exercised the full pastoral authority, both in preaching the word and administering the sacraments, and making such laws and regulations as they judged proper for the good of their people, the priests were always considered their helpers, subject to their laws, and who had no authority even to administer the sacraments, but only by receiving faculties from them; and these faculties the bishops could give in what measure and proportion they judged fitting, or refuse them entirely, if they saw cause; and this has been the constant practice of the church to this day. To the bishops alone, it belongs to meet in council, and make such laws and constitutions for the good and regulation, both of the whole church, when the council was general, for particular portions of the church, when the council was not general, as they judged necessary for the good of religion. To the bishops it belongs to meet in general councils, and there, as the only judges of doctrine, to declare and decide concerning the truth of our

holy faith, and to condemn all false and heretical tenets.

The holy fathers, from the earliest ages, speak in the strongest terms on the obedience and respect which all owe to the episcopal authority. Thus, St. Ignatius, the martyr, disciple of the apostles and successor of St. Peter in the see of Antioch, says, "Reverence your bishop as Christ himself, as the blessed apostles have commanded us—for who is the bishop, but he who has all power and principality over all? Epist. ad Tral. "It becomes you to obey your bishop, and in nothing to resist him—for, as our Lord does nothing without his Father, so neither ought you without your bishop, whether you be priest, deacon or laic," Epis. ad Magnes. St. Cyprian says, that heresies and schisms rise from no other cause but disobedience to the chief pastors, Epist. 55. Tertullian writes thus: "the bishop, indeed, has the right to give baptism, and next the priests and deacons, but not without the authority of the bishop. Lib. de Bapt. c. 17.

Jesus Christ ordained the apostles giving them authority to perform all their sacred

functions, and these apostles ordained the seven deacons; the scripture says, that, "praying, they imposed hands upon them," Acts vi. 6. "And when Saul and Barnabas were sent to the ministry by a special command of the Holy Ghost, they, fasting, and praying, and laying their hands upon them, sent them away," Acts xiii. 3. From these express declarations of the apostle to Timothy, "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood;" 1 Tim. iv. 14. "I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands," 2 Tim. i. 6. And exhorted him to be cautious whom he admits to this sacrament, he says, "Impose not hands lightly upon any man," 1 Tim. v. 22. St. Paul says, "No man taketh that honour upon himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was," Heb. v. 4.

Christ gave them power to preach the gospel, to teach all nations, and to baptize, before his ascension, as related, Matt. x. 18; Mark xvi.; to consecrate the Holy Eucharist, and offer up the sacrifice of his body and blood,

when at the last supper he commanded them to do what he just had done, Luke xxii. 19, to forgive sins, when after his resurrection, "he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven," John xx. 22. And so of all the other sacred powers of the priesthood, which he communicated to his apostles in the most ample manner, and thereby made them priests and pastors of his people, and authorized them as his own substitutes, to communicate the same powers to others after them and carry on to the end of the world the great work he had begun for the salvation of souls; for, as St. Paul observes, "every high priest taken from among men, is appointed for men in things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins." Heb. v. i. "And how can they preach unless they be sent?" Rom. x. 15; "For he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber," saith Jesus Christ himself. John x. 1, 3. All those that intrude themselves into the pastoral office of themselves, and pretend to teach and preach, and admin-

ister any sacrament, without having received the proper power from Jesus Christ to do so, are only impostors and deluders of souls, "blind leaders of the blind," who together with those that follow them, "fall into the pit," Matt. xv. 14. St. Paul says, 1 Tim. iii. 1, "This is a faithful saying, if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." In Scotland the reformers displaced all those ministers who would not by oath renounce episcopacy. The Presbyterian ministers are laymen having no ordination from any bishop, and therefore have no authority to teach, preach, or administer any sacrament. Although the English protestants flatter themselves that they at least have ordination from a Catholic bishop; yet they are equally destitute of ordination, and proved to be so by the Catholic writers of those days, when facts were fresh in the minds of all Catholics.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SINGLE LIFE OF PRIESTS.

St. Paul writes thus to the Corinthians: "I would that all men were even as myself; but every one has his proper gift of God; one after this manner, and another after that: I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as myself," 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8. And again, "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for things that are of this world, how he may please his wife," 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33. Whence he concludes, v. 38, "So then he that giveth his daughter in marriage, does well; but he that giveth her not, does better."

It was this induced the Catholic church, in ancient times, to lay a restraint from marriage of persons engaged in holy orders. And thus she was directed to it by the very example of the apostles, of whom St. Jerom writes thus; "The apostles (says he) either were virgins: or they who were married had no commerce

with their wives." He goes on thus: "Bishops, priests, and deacons are either chosen virgins, or widowers; or at least abstain from their wives, after their ordination as long as they live." Epist. 50. St. Epiphanius writes in the following manner: "He that lives as a husband with his wife, though he never was twice married, is not admitted by the church to the order of deacon, priest, bishop, or even subdeacon. But only he, who either breaks off all commerce with his wife, or is deprived of her by death." Her. 59.

What authentic witnesses are these of this ancient discipline of the church! But though they had been silent, the canons themselves, and decrees of councils, held even before the great council of Nice, would suffice to proclaim its antiquity. That of Elvira under the great Osius, Ann. 300, forbids churchmen the use of marriage under pain of being deposed, Can. 33. The council of Neocesarea, about the year 315, under Vitalis, bishop of Antioch, forbids priests to marry under the same penalty, Can. 1.

In the fifth age, it is manifest from the council of Chalcedon, Can. 14, that in some pro-

vinces, even those who had received the lesser orders as readers, were not allowed to marry. And I insist positively upon it, that there is no example in antiquity of any one bishop or priest, that ever was permitted by the church to marry, after he had received the order of priesthood.

The same is to be said of all those, whether men or women, who had consecrated themselves to God by solemn vows. In so much, that as many as returned to the world, or pretended to engage themselves in the bonds of wedlock after making such vows, were in all antiquity looked upon as apostates from the faith, and worse than adulterers. "I hesitate not to affirm, (says St. Augustine,) that the breach of a religious vow is worse than adultery." L. de bono Viduitatis, c. 11. And St. Chrysotom speaks the same language in his epistle to Theodorius, a fallen monk: "marriage," (says this father,) "is a just and lawful thing, I grant it. Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled. But no, it is not a thing in your power; for being once joined to your heavenly spouse, to leave him, and fall into the embraces of a wife, is adultery. Give

it a thousand times if you please, the name of marriage, I say it is as much worse than adultery, as God is better and greater than womankind." Nay, St. Paul himself says of widows consecrated to God, that "when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation; because they have cast off their first faith," 1 Tim. v. 11, 12. The reason whereof is plain, because the observance of vows freely made to God are strictly commanded by God himself in the following words, "When thou shalt make a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform." Deut. xxiii. 21, 23.

I shall add but one thing more, viz. That the single life of bishops and priests is a matter of ecclesiastical government or discipline only: whence I infer, 1. That the church had always authority to make it a law, especially in regard of those that offer themselves freely to holy orders. How many private persons are there, that will not take servants into their families, but upon condition, that they shall keep unmarried as long as they continue in their service? And shall not the church of

Christ be allowed to make her conditions with those of her children who desire to enter into her service, by presenting themselves voluntarily to holy orders?

I infer, 2. That as the church had authority to make such laws in the primitive times, so had she the same authority in after ages to continue or enforce it. For I see no reason why the church of Christ should lose any part of her legislative power by time or age. Whence,

I infer, 3. That the proceedings of the first reformers were most unwarrantable, in assuming a power to license the violation of a superior law, which had been recommended by the very example of the apostles, as I have proved from St. Jerom; had been consecrated by the practice of antiquity, and enjoined by the decrees of innumerable councils; and what was still more scandalous, to countenance the breach of the most sacred and solemn vows made to God himself. Such was the conscience and religious piety of the first reformers.

"And I saw: and behold a Lamb stood on mount Sion, and with him a hundred forty-

four thousand having his name and the name of his father written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of great thunder: and the voice which I heard, was as of harpers, harping on their harps. And they sung as it were a new canticle, before the throne, and before the four living creatures, and the ancients: and no man could say the canticle, but those hundred forty-four thousand, who were purchased from the earth. These are they who were not defiled with women: for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were purchased from among men, the first fruits to God, and to the Lamb: And in their mouth was found no lie, for they are without spot before the throne of God." Rev. xiv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

CHAPTER XIV.

OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

By the word Mass, we understand the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, offered to God in an unbloody manner, by the hands of the priest; or what amounts to the same, an external oblation made to God of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine. Now it is manifest by the most ancient records of Christianity, by innumerable testimonies of the holy fathers ever since the time of the apostles; by the ancient liturgies of all nations, Latins, Greeks, Nestorians, Armenians, Ethiopians, Coptites, Goths, &c., and even by the confession of Protestants themselves, (for which you may see Dr. Field, B. 3 of the Church, ch. 19, p. 107,) that the Holy Eucharist has always been used in the church, not only as a sacrament, but also as a sacrifice instituted by Christ at his last supper. For proof whereof the ancient Greeks and Latin Fathers, St. Justin and St. Irenæus in the second age, St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine in the fourth, allege the words of God in the prophet Malachi as they read them: "From

the rising of the sun to the going down of it, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place is sacrificed and offered to my name a clean oblation." Mal. i. 11, 12.

For a farther proof of it, these words of the psalmist, "Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedeck," Psalm xc. 4, are urged by St. Cyprian in the third age; St. Jerome, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustin in the fourth, and by St. Isidore, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret in the fifth. For as they argue, priests of the order of Aaron sacrificed beasts; but Melchisedeck's sacrifice was "bread and wine," Gen. xiv. 18, a figure of the Holy Eucharist, by the daily offering whereof, and the fruits of his passion, Christ is a priest for ever.

St. Cyprian calls the blessed eucharist, a "true and full sacrifice," Epist. 63. St. Augustine, a "true and sovereign sacrifice," L. 10, d'Cev. Dei, c. 20. Eusebius, "an expiation for all the world," L. 1. Dem. Ev. c. 10. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "a spiritual sacrifice, an unbloody worship, a propitiatory victim," Cal. Myst. 5.

Nor is the very name of Mass an invention of later ages. For thus the holy sacrifice of

the altar was called, above fourteen hundred years ago. Witness first, St. Ambrose, who writes thus: "I continued the office, I began to say Mass," &c., L. 2, Epist. 14. And 2dly, St. Leo, whose words are remarkable: "When the multitude, (says he,) is so great that the church cannot hold them all, let there be no difficulty made to offer the sacrifice oftener than once. For some part of the people must of necessity be deprived of their devotions, if following the custom of saying Mass but once, none can offer up the sacrifice but they who come early in the morning." St. Leo, Epist. 11, (olim 81,) ad Deoscorum. "We always offer, (says St. Chrysostom,) the same Christ." Therefore the sacrifice is the same. Are there many Christs, because he is offered in many places? No, Christ is every where the same. He is entire here, and entire there, and has but one body; as therefore, his body is the same, though offered up in different places, so the sacrifice is the same. He is our high priest, who offered that victim which cleanses us. We now offer the same, which was offered then, and which cannot be consumed." Hom. 17, in Epist. ad Heb.

CHAPTER XV.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

By transubstantiation, as it regards the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, we mean nothing else, but a change of the bread and wine into the true and real body and blood of Christ, made by the words of consecration. Nothing is more evident than that it is the doctrine of the ancient fathers. I shall only quote a few out of many to avoid being tedious. First, St. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, writes thus: "Since therefore, Christ himself does thus affirm and say of the bread, this is my body, who from henceforward dares be so bold as to doubt of it? And hence the same does assure and say, 'this is my blood,' who, I say, can doubt of it, and say it is not his blood? In Cana of Galilee, he once with his sole will turned water into wine, which much resembles blood, and does he not deserve to be believed, that he changed wine into blood." Catec. Myst. 2dly. St. Gregory Nyssen writes thus: "I do therefore now rightly believe, that the bread sanctified by the word

of God is changed into the body of God the word." And again, soon after, "Here (says he,) likewise the bread, (as the apostle says,) is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. Not so, that by being eaten becomes the body of the word, but because it is suddenly changed into his body by this word, 'This is my body.'—And this effected by the virtue of benediction, by which the nature of those things, which appear, are transelemented into it." (In erat. Catech. C. 37, T. 3, Edit. Par.)

3dly. St. Chrysostom sets forth this truth in the following manner, (Hom. 83, in Matt.) "Let us always (says he) believe God, and not contradict him, though that which he says seems to contradict both our thoughts and our senses.—For his word cannot deceive us, but our senses may easily be deceived. He never errs, but we are often mistaken. Since therefore, he says, 'This is my body,' let us be fully persuaded of it." And in the same homily he writes thus: "The things we propose are not done by human power. He that wrought these things at his last supper, is the author of what is done here. We hold but

the place of ministers; but he that sanctifies and changes them is Christ himself."

I appeal here to the judgment and sincerity of any unbiassed reader, whether these three Greek fathers do not deliver the doctrine of transubstantiation, as clearly and strongly as any Roman Catholic can now do. I omit a multitude of quotations of the same force, and will only add one from St. Ambrose, a Latin father, to show the unanimous agreement of antiquity in this doctrinal point. His words are remarkably plain. 4thly, "Perhaps, (says he,) you may tell me I see another thing—I must therefore prove that what you receive is not that, which nature framed, but that, which the benediction has consecrated; and that the benediction has greater force than nature. Moses held a rod in his hand, he threw it down, and it was made a serpent. Again, he took hold of the serpent, and it returned into the nature of a rod. The rivers of Egypt ran with streams of pure water, when presently blood gushed forth out of the fountain-vein, there was no water in the rivers. And again, by the prayer of Moses the blood ceased, and the nature of waters returned." To these

he adds other miracles; as, that when Moses held up his rod the sea opened a passage for the Israelites; that Jordan ran back; that Moses brought water out of the rock by striking it; and that Elias made iron swim upon the water, contrary to its nature. Then he goes on thus: "We see, therefore, that grace is stronger than nature. Now if a man's blessing could change the course of nature, what do we think of the divine consecration itself, in which the very words of our Saviour operate? For the sacrament which you receive is made by the words of Christ. And if Elias' words were able to draw fire from heaven, will not the words of Christ be able to change the nature of the elements? "He said and they were made, he commanded and they were created," Psalm xlviii. 5. Is not then the word of Christ, which could give a being to that which had none, able to change those things, which are, into what they were not before? For it is not less to give new natures to things, than to change their natures." Lib. de initiatis.

Thus the ancient fathers give testimony for the doctrine of transubstantiation, and are

authentic witnesses that it was the public faith of the church in her purest times. Whence it is plain, that they taught no other doctrine, than what they had received by a constant tradition from the apostles. Protestants object, and say, If it be not true bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ, which we receive in the sacrament, it follows that our senses are deceived; and by consequence, the apostles could not be sure they saw Christ work any miracles, which takes away the great evidence of Christianity.

This objection, so highly magnified by some of our adversaries, must either suppose, that we must never trust our eyes or any of our senses, unless we may always trust, when they give us jointly the best information they are capable of. The first of these suppositions is contrary both to reason and religion, nay even to experience, and to our senses themselves. For all these correct the errors of sense, if I may be allowed that way of speaking. The sun appears to our eyes not bigger than a span, and the fixed stars a great deal less. But reason tells us they may be greater than the earth. A straight stick, if you put

the end of it under water, will appear crooked, but take it out, and your eyes will discover their own mistake. The two disciples going to Emmaus, had Jesus in their company, they both heard him and saw him; yet took him for another, because "their eyes were held, that they should not know him," Luke xxiv. 16; at length even by their senses they found they had been misinformed; for soon after, "their eyes were opened, and they knew him," 31. But because their sight had deceived them on this occasion, were they never to trust to it any more? Were they not to believe that they had seen any miracles of Christ? St. Mary Magdalen was deceived in the same manner; "She saw Jesus, yet knew not that it was he, and supposed him to be the gardener," John xx. 14, 15. But was she not to believe her eyes when she fell at his feet? Matt. xxviii. 9, when she "told the disciples that she had seen the Lord?" John xx. 18, when she saw him nailed to the cross, Matt. xxvii. 55, and laid in the tomb? 61. The second supposition, to wit, that our senses must always be trusted, is equally false. For 1st, The two disciples going to Emmaus had

the joint information of both their eyes and ears; yet I hope they might be sure and faithful witnesses of Christ's miracles. 2dly, Joshua's eyes deceived him when he said to the angel, "Art thou for us or for our adversaries?" Jos. v. 13. And all his senses might then have been under the same mistake. But was he not to trust his eyes, when he saw the sun stand still, the walls of Jericho tumble, the waters of Jordan rise up in heaps, and so many other miracles done both by Moses and himself?

3dly, When St. Peter was rescued out of prison, he "knew for certain that God had sent his angel, and had delivered him out of the hands of Herod," Acts xii. 11. Here then is a fact, in which he both believed and disbelieved the information of his senses. Had he believed them as to the person of his guide (whom he saw, heard, and felt, when he struck him on the side,) he must have judged him to be a man, not an angel. In this then he found his senses were mistaken. Yet he still believed his eyes, and had nothing but his eyes to trust to, that he saw two miracles wrought in his favour, viz. the falling off of

his chains, and the iron gates opening of themselves.

I speak as to wise men; judge ye yourselves of what I say. The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord, 1 Cor. x. 15, 16. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils, 20. It is objected, that St. Paul thrice calls it bread and wine after consecration, 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28. To which I answer, that nothing is more common even in familiar discourse, than to call a thing by the name of that, out of which it is made, or from which it is changed. Thus it was said to Adam, Gen. iii. 19, "Dust thou art;" Because though then a living man, he had been made of dust. In like manner, the serpent, that was made by substantial change from Aaron's rod, is still called a rod in scripture, because changed from it: "They cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods," Exod. vii. 12. Again, nothing is more familiar than to name things from the appearance

which they have to our senses. The scripture itself says, "Behold there stood a man over against him," Jos. v. 13. Yet in the same place we are told he was not really a man, but the "captain of the Lord's host," that is, an angel. So St. Mark assures us, that the women "entering into the sepulchre, saw a young man," xvi. 5. But he had only the name because he appeared so. For he was not really a young man, but an angel, Matt. xxviii. 5. In like manner therefore, the body of Christ in the sacrament is by a proper and familiar figure, called bread by St. Paul, because it is changed from bread, has to our senses the likeness of bread, and nourishes the soul, as bread nourishes the body. If you ask what this consecrated bread is? our Saviour tells you, John vi. 52, "The bread I will give, is my flesh." St. Paul tells you, 1 Cor. x. 16, "It is the communion of the body of Christ." And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said, Take ye and eat; this is my body. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks; and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of this. For this is my

blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins. Matt. xxvi. 26, 28. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until he come, 1 Cor. xi. 26. And I saw, and behold, in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the ancients, a lamb standing as it were slain. We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle. Heb. x. 10. Many other scripture proofs might be added.

CHAPTER XVI.

COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

"WHOSOEVER shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," 1 Cor. xi. 27. Now if either eating or drinking unworthily suffices to render us guilty both of the body and blood of our Lord, it follows, by an undeniable consequence, that either eating or drinking worthily renders us partakers both of his body and blood: his body being ever living, the blood is never separate from his flesh and divinity. I know very well, that to avoid the unanswerable force of this argument, the Protestant translators of the Bible have made bold with this text, by changing *or* into *and* in the text itself; which entirely alters the sense of it.

Bishop Montague writes: "Where does the scripture," says he, "command that the people should receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper in both kinds?—The scripture teaches no such thing, the scripture does not command it." T. 1. Orig. p. 396.

The Protestants of France are most certainly of Bishop Montague's opinion. For though they generally administer the sacrament in both kinds, oblige all that can to receive it in that manner, yet, in a synod at Poitiers, An. 1560, they decreed, (chap. xiii. art. 7, of the Lord's supper,) that the bread of our Lord's supper ought to be administered to those who cannot drink wine: as many in France, by their natural constitution, can neither endure the smell nor taste of it. This, I think, is a good Protestant testimony, that receiving the communion in one kind is neither sacrilege, nor mangling the sacrament, nor violation of any divine precept. For, if it were, no necessity could excuse it; and they who could not receive both kinds, would be obliged to receive neither the one nor the other.

Now there are three undeniable facts, which prove that communion in one kind was practised even by the primitive church. 1. In the communion of infants, who were allowed to drink of the cup without receiving the consecrated Host, St. Cypr. de Lapsis. 2. In domestic communion; the faithful being permitted, by reason of persecutions, to carry

with them consecrated Hosts which they could easily keep in their houses in order to receive the sacrament in private, when they durst not meet in public to celebrate the sacred mysteries; Tert. L. 2, ad Uxorem, c. 5, St. Cypr. L. de Lapsis. And 3. One kind was also used in administering it to the sick, St. Denys of Alex. apud Eusch. 6, Hist. c. 44.

From these undeniable instances of communions in one kind practised by the primitive church, I infer it was her judgment; 1. That communion in one kind is not forbid by Christ, whose laws cannot be violated upon any pretence whatsoever. 2. That the sacrament is not mutilated by it: for then it would be sacrilege to receive it in one kind, which the primitive church would not have suffered. And 3. That neither the testament of Christ is violated, nor the faithful deprived of any part of our Saviour's legacy: both which are impieties, which the primitive church would have abhorred: whence I conclude again, that receiving in one or both kinds is a matter of discipline only, which therefore the church has full authority to regulate as she judges most fitting. Nay, considering that the instances I have pro-

duced of communions in one kind were practised by the church in the very first and second age after the apostles, we may reasonably suppose, she followed in this the example of the apostles themselves.

But did not Christ institute both kinds? And is it not then acting contrary to the institution to receive the sacrament in one kind only? I answer, 1. The primitive church did not think it to be contrary to Christ's institution: and I see no reason why we should think ourselves wiser than the primitive church.

I answer, 2. That there is a large difference between instituting both kinds, and obliging all to receive both kinds. God instituted marriage, but all are not bound to marry. Christ likewise instituted priesthood and episcopy; but all are not bound to be priests or bishops. Therefore, unless there be a positive precept produced, which obliges all without exception to receive the sacrament in both kinds, the institution alone cannot import any such general obligation. Now it is very strange, that if there were any such positive precept, the primitive church should either

know nothing of it, or act contrary to it if they knew it. But why then did Christ institute both kinds? I answer, because the Eucharist is not only a sacrament, that is, a sign of invisible grace instituted for the nourishment of our souls, but also a sacrifice, which is one of the most essential parts of religion: and for this reason Christ instituted the blessed Eucharist under both kinds, that by the mystical separation of the body and blood upon the altar, signified by the separate forms of consecration, their real separation on the cross might be more perfectly represented, and so be both a standing lively memorial of his death he once suffered, and a perpetual oblation of infinite value for us.

I add that there are several circumstances relating to the institution, which never were thought to be obligatory in after times; I shall only mention two. 1st. The apostles received the sacrament sitting, as is expressed by three of the evangelists. Whereas those of the Church of England, as well as Catholics, received it always kneeling, unless hindered by sickness. And 2dly. Christ consecrated and gave the blessed sacrament to his apostles

in "supper time, or after supper," Matt. xxvi. 26. "As they were eating," Mark xiv. 18. "As they did eat," Luke xxii. 19, 20. "He took bread, &c. likewise also the chalice after supper, saying," &c. Nay, we do not find in scripture, that the blessed sacrament was ever consecrated or given at any other time, and it is still called the Lord's supper. Yet, because Christ never enjoined this practice by any positive precept, the church has made a law against it; and if any one should presume either to consecrate or give the blessed sacrament in supper time or after supper, in opposition to this decree of the church, he would most certainly become guilty of schism, though he had an undeniable example in scripture to colour his disobedience. Nay, an example set him by all the apostles and Christ himself; and that without any scriptural evidence for the contrary practice.

CHAPTER XVII.

PURGATORY.

By the doctrine of purgatory, we mean a middle state of souls; that is, of the souls of such persons, as those who have neither lived so innocently as to pass straight to heaven from this life, nor yet so ill as to be doomed to everlasting flames.

First, It is said, Matt. xii. 32, that "whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come." Upon which text St. Augustin discourses thus: "It would not be truly said of some sins, that they shall neither be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come, unless there were other sins, which, though not forgiven in this life, may yet be forgiven in the next," L. 21, de Civ. Dei, c. 24. Now no sort of sins enters into heaven, and there is no forgiveness in hell; therefore there must be a third state, where some sins may be forgiven. That is a place of temporal punishment after this life.

2dly, It is said, Rom. ii. 6, "God will ren-

der to every man according to his deeds." And Apoc. xxi. 27, "Nothing that defiles shall enter into heaven." Whence it follows, that as there is a middle state of men in this world, who are neither entirely innocent, nor yet in a state of damnation, there must also be for a time a middle state of suffering in the next life. It is St. Augustin's argument, in Euch. c. 109, 110. And the text of scripture now mentioned prove it sufficiently. For let us suppose three sorts of persons together. First. A child newly baptized, or a just man who has brought forth worthy fruits of repentance for all his sins; secondly, a man guilty of any of these crimes of which St. Paul says, that "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God," Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. Thirdly, A person, who either has not fully satisfied the divine justice for all his past sins, or committed some small offences, whereof he has not yet repented: now if these three sorts of persons die suddenly, for example in their sleep, the first are happy, Apoc. xiv. 13.

The second are eternally miserable and doomed to hell. But if he will render to every man according to his works, what becomes of

the third sort, who are neither in a state of damnation, nor entirely innocent? Where must they be expiated? In heaven nothing defiled enters there. Out of hell there is no redemption. It is then as certain, that there is a middle state of suffering after death, as it is that even just men are too often deficient in their duty, and that God after this life will render to every man according to his deeds; that is, it is as certain as that the gospel is true.

The prophet told David upon his repentance, that his sin was pardoned, 2 Kings xii. 13. But he let him know at the same time, that he was still to undergo many afflictions for it, "as that his child should die," v. 13, and that "the sword should never depart from his house," v. 10, &c.

If we consult antiquity, we shall find it has always been the practice of the Catholic church to pray for the relief of the souls of the faithful departed. "The church (says Mr. Thorndike) has always assisted them with the prayers of the living." Just Weights, c. 16, p. 107. "And the practice of the church, (says he,) in interceding for the dead at the

celebration of the Eucharist, is so general and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in by imposture, but that the same aspersion will seem to take hold of the common Christianity;" ib. p. 106. Indeed this is so manifest a truth, that a man must reject the strongest evidence to deny it; as will appear from the few following quotations, which, for brevity sake, I have chosen out of many.

In the end of the second century, Tertullian says of a faithful widow, "She both prays for the soul of her husband, and begs a refreshment for him in the mean time, and keeps his anniversaries," &c. L. de monogam, c. 10.

One part of Arius's heresy in the fourth century, according to St. Epiphanius, was, "That the prayers and alms of the living did the dead no good;" Her. 75, sect. 3, T. 1, p. 908. Against whom he writes, that the church has this tradition from Christ, "that prayers are profitable for the dead, sect. 8, p. 912. And that we mention the saints and other faithful departed in a quite different manner." "The saints, that we may give a singular honour to Christ, and others that we may obtain mercy for them;" ibid.

St. Chrysostom writes thus: "The apostles (says he) did not in vain command these things, that in the venerable and dreadful mysteries the dead should be remembered: for they knew they would derive a considerable advantage from it;" Hom. 3, Epist. ad Philip. And again; "The dead (says he) may be helped by prayers, and alms, and offerings; because they were not instituted in vain:" and concludes, "Let us therefore help them. For we have before us the expiatory sacrifice of the world. It may happen, that we may obtain a total pardon for them by prayers, by oblations, by the saints, who are named with them." Hom. 41, in Epist. ad Cor.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem writes thus: "Lastly, We pray for all that die amongst us: thinking it to be the greatest help that can be to their souls to have the holy and dreadful sacrifice of the altar offered in supplication for them." Cat. Mystag. 5, p. 291.

St. Augustin said Mass for the soul of his mother, as he says in his confessions. But, (Serm. 17, sect. 2,) he writes thus: "By the prayers of the holy church, (says he,) and the

wholesome sacrifice and alms, it is not to be doubted, but the dead are assisted. So that God deals more mercifully with them, than their sins deserved: because it is the practice of the whole church to pray and offer sacrifice for them." The second Cabilon council decreed:—It further seemeth good to us, that in all the solemnities of masses, our Lord be prayed to in the due place for the souls of the dead, &c. therefore the holy church keeps anciently this custom, &c.; c. 79.

The first council of Nice decreed thus:—When a bishop dies, let notice be given of his death to all the churches and monasteries in the parish, that prayers may be made for him; cap. 65, Arah. A. D. 325.

The prayers of the church are heard of God in favour of some of the dead, who being regenerated in Christ, have not lived so ill in this life as to make themselves unworthy of this mercy after their death; nor likewise so well as not to stand in need of this mercy; Aug. civit. Lib. 21, cap. 24. According to the tradition which the fathers have left us, and which the whole church observes, when any one dead in the communion of the body and

blood of Christ, he is prayed for in that place of the sacrifice, where the dead are recommended, and mention is made that the sacrifice is offered for them; Aug. serm. 32; in verbis apostili, cap. 2.

And again; with that transitory fire whereof the apostle said, he shall be saved, yet so as by fire, not capital, but little sins are purged; Serm. 41, de sanctis.

Also, "he shall be safe so as by fire, and because it is said he shall be safe that fire is condemned, yet that fire shall be more grievous than whatever a man can suffer in this life: purge me, Lord, in this life, and make me such an one as shall not need that mending fire." In Ps. 37.

And again: some of the faithful are saved sooner or later by this fire, that purifies them according as they have loved the things of the world: Augustine de Fide. Spe. Charit. cap. 69.

If a man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so by fire; 1 Cor. iii. 15. Because Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God, being put to death,

indeed, in flesh, but brought to life by the spirit. In which also he came and preached to those spirits who were in prison: who in time past had been incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building; 1 Pet. iii. 19. See here a proof of a third, or middle state of souls: for these spirits in prison, to whom Christ went to preach, after his death, were not in heaven, nor yet in hell of the damned; because heaven is no prison: and Christ did not go to preach to the damned. For David did not ascend into heaven. Acts ii. 34. Thou also by the blood of thy testament hast sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit, wherein is no water. Zach. ix. 11; Mach. xii. 43, says that Judas Machabeus sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they be loosed from sins. The book of Machabees is canonical, and the third council of Carthage, (held in the year 397,) has asserted it, (can. 47,) in the canon. St. Paul says, "What shall

they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again, why are they then baptized for them," 1 Cor. xv. 29. "Ascending on high, he led captivity captive, he gave gifts to men; that he ascended, what is it? but because he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth." Ephes. iv. 8, 9.

CHAPTER XVIII.

PENANCE.

CHRIST says, (John xx. 22, 23,) "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." And St. Matt. xviii. 18, "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

This authority was certainly given to them and to their successors till the end of the world; no less than the commission to preach, and baptize, &c. which, though addressed to the apostles, was certainly designed to continue with their successors, the pastors of the church for ever, according to that of Christ, Matt. xxviii. 20. "Lo, I am with you always even till the end of the world."

St. Chrysostom speaks thus on the subject: "Christ has given that power to priests, which would not be given either to angels or to archangels. Earthly princes have also power to bind only the bodies, but the bond of the

priests toucheth the very soul itself, and reacheth to heaven. What power, I beseech you, can be greater than this?'' Chrys. lib. 3, de Sacerd.

But as God has made men his instruments in raising the dead to life; so we believe that he has been pleased to appoint that his ministers should in virtue of his commission, as his instruments, and by his power, absolve repenting sinners, and this is evident from the texts above quoted; it must be false zeal, under pretext of maintaining the honour of God, to contradict this commission which he has so evidently given to his church. What then is required on the part of the sinner in order to obtain forgiveness of his sins in the sacrament of penance? There are three things, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. By contrition we mean, a hearty sorrow for having offended so good a God, with a firm purpose of amendment. By confession we mean, a full and sincere accusation made to God's minister, of all mortal sins, which, after a diligent examination of conscience, a person can call to his remembrance. By satisfaction, we mean, a faithful performance of the penance

enjoined by the priest. First, Confession is a precept of God. Numb. v. 6, 7:—"When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty, then they shall confess their sin which they have done," &c. Secondly, The example of the people that heard the preaching of St. John the Baptist, who were baptized by him, "confessing their sins," St. Matt. iii. 6. Thirdly, The prescription of St. James, v. 16: "Confess your sins one to another;" that is to the priests, or elders of the church, whom the apostle had ordered to be called for; v. 14. Fourthly, The practice of the first Christians, Acts xix. 18. "Many that believed came, and confessed and declared their deeds." Again, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness;" 1 John i. 9. David confessed his sins, and was saved; Cain denied his sins, and was damned.

Now certain it is, that had the first Christians been in the habit of not going to confession, their followers never would have taken such a yoke upon their shoulders; inasmuch

as all men revolt at every thing irksome and painful in religion, as the practice of confession most certainly would be, had not Christ and his apostles taught it as a means of receiving pardon of the sins committed after baptism."

The whole world could not have gone mad at once, so as to take upon them such a task, unless it came from the first ages of the church. It must be admitted that all Christians, before the pretended reformation, held confession as a doctrine coming down from Christ; no matter whether Catholics or heretics: so that the reformers were the first to throw off the yoke of Christ.

In the second age, St. Clement: "But if, perhaps, sins, or infidelity, or any other evils have crept hiddenly into any one's heart, let him that hath a care of his soul not blush to confess these things to him that rules him, that he may be cured of him by the word of God, that is, the words of absolution instituted by Christ, and good council. And again, St. Peter taught us to break the evil thoughts coming to our hearts upon Christ, and to

manifest them to the priests of our Lord." Epist. i. 2.

In the second age, Tertullian: "God, foreseeing the prison, to wit, of sin, the gate of pardon being past, and the bolt of washing being shut, hath yet permitted something to lie open, and hath placed in the porch the second penance, which may open to them that knock." L. de pænitent. And again, "let him blot out what hath been committed by doing penance; by weeping, by fasting, &c." Homil. 6, in Exod. The same age—Tertullian reprehends those who, for human bashfulness, neglected to confess their sins. Lib. de pænitent.

In the third age, Origen: "there is, by penance, the remission of sins, when he washeth his bed with tears, and blusheth not to show his sins to the priest of the Lord." Homil. 2, in Levit. And again, "Peter and Paul, and all such as have been placed in the church after the apostles, are also physicians, to whom the discipline of curing wounds hath been committed, &c., because God wills not the death of sinners, but their repentance." Homil. in Psal. xxxvii.

St. Cyprian, in the same age: "Let every

one of you, I beseech you, brethren, confess his sins, whilst he is yet in this life, whilst confession may be admitted, whilst every one's satisfaction may be admitted, whilst every one's satisfaction and remission made by the priest is grateful with our Lord." Tract de Lapsis.

In the fourth age, St. Ambrose: "confess freely to the priest the hidden secrets of thy soul, and show them as thou wouldst thy hidden wounds to thy physician." Orat. in Mulierem peccatricem. Again, writing to the Novatian heretics, "Why do you baptize, (saith he,) if sins cannot be remitted by a man, for in baptism there is the remission of all sins, nor is it material whether priests challenge to themselves this power by penance or by baptism." Ambrose, Lib. de pænit. c. 7.

In the same age, St. Hierome: "as there, in the old law, the priest makes the leprous person clean, or unclean, so here the bishop or priest bindeth or looseth." In c. 16, Matt.

In the same age, St. Athanasius: "If thy bonds are not yet loosed, commend thyself to the disciples of Jesus, for there are those that can absolve thee, by the power they received

from our Saviour, when he said, whatsoever you shall bind, &c." Sermo. in ella verba; Invenietis pullum.

In the fifth age, St. Augustine: "our Lord, because he is pious and merciful, will have us confess our sins in this world, that we may not be confounded for them in the next." Homil. 12. And again, "if murder be committed by a Catechumen, it is washed away by baptism; if by one baptized, it needs penance and reconciliation." Lib. 2, de adulterinis conjug. c. 16. The Calibon council has defined, that their confession being made, penance be enjoined to penitents by priests; Can. 8. The council of Florence defined penance to be a sacrament, and that the effect of it is absolution from sin; Decret. Super Union, Jacobin et Armen. The third council of Florence decreed that the time of penance should be appointed by the arbitrament of bishops, according to the difference of their sins. Can. 31, A. D. 397.

The third part of this sacrament is satisfaction or penitential works. "And the men of Ninive proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest to the least, and the

king cast away his robe from him, and was clothed in sackcloth, and sat in ashes, and God saw their works, that they were turned from their evil ways; and God had mercy with regard to the evil which he had said, that he would do them, and he did it not;" Jonas iii. 4. From this example of the Ninivites our Saviour takes occasion to inculcate the necessity of doing penance in the strongest terms: "The men of Ninive," says he, "shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they did penance at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here;" Matt. xii. 41. Job says, "I have spoken unwisely—therefore I reprehend myself, and do penance in dust and ashes;" Job. xlii. 3, 6. "Gird yourselves with hair-cloth, lament and howl, for the fierce anger of the Lord is not turned away from us —wash thy heart from wickedness, O Jerusalem! that thou mayst be saved;" Jer. iv. 8, 14. "Gird thyself with sackcloth, O daughter of my people! and sprinkle thee with ashes: make thee mourning as for an only son, a bitter lamentation;" Jer. vi. 26.

"Be converted and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin;" Ezek. viii. 30. "Now therefore, saith the Lord, be converted to me with all your heart, in fasting, and in weeping, and in mourning;" Joel ii. 12. In all which texts, we see that the doing penitential works is joined with the other conditions of true repentance, as necessary to avert the anger of God, and find mercy with him. When all the people went out to St. John the Baptist, to be baptized by him, he said, "Ye offspring of vipers, who hath shown you to flee from the wrath to come?" And immediately teaching them the means to avoid the wrath, he adds, "Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of penance;" Luke iii. 7. St. Paul also declares, that the great subject of his preaching to the Jews was, "that they should do penance, and turn to God, doing works worthy of penance;" Acts xxvi. 20. Christ himself condemns the people of Corozain and Bethsaida, for not "doing penance, sitting in sackcloth and ashes," after the works he had done among them, as the people of Tyre and Sidon would have done, if they

had received the like favours; Luke x. 13. "I set my face to the Lord my God, to pray and make supplication, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes." Dan. ix. 3.

CHAPTER XIX.

HOLY WATER.

Holy water, is water sanctified by the word of God and prayer, 1 Tim. iv. 5, in order to certain spiritual effects. The chief are, 1. To make us mindful of our baptism, by which we entered into Christ's mystical body, and therefore we are taught to sprinkle ourselves with it as often as we enter the material temple (which is a type thereof) to celebrate his praise. 2. To fortify against the illusions of evil spirits, against whom it hath great force, as witnessed Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. L. 5, c. 31.

Holy water is used ever since the apostles' time; Pope Alexander I. who was but the seventh Pope from St. Peter, makes mention of it in one of his epistles. "He shall dip hyssop in the waters, and sprinkle therewith all the tent, and all the furniture, and men that are defiled; and in this manner he shall purify the unclean; Numb. xix. 18, 19. The waters spoken of in this text, were the waters of purification in the old law, which, by the appoint-

ment of Almighty God, both persons and things were, in certain cases, to be sprinkled. "Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed; thou shalt wash me, and I shall be made whiter than snow;" Psalm l. 9. Even the very term Holy Water is found in the Bible; Numb. v. 17. The church of Christ is the best authority we can have both in faith and practice; she will teach what rites we shall receive, and what not. I showed you that in the old law aspersions were used in certain cases. I will now show you some authorities from the Holy Fathers. St. Gregory in his epistle wrote thus to St. Melitus, "Let the idols be destroyed, let holy water be made, let it be sprinkled in said temples. Let altars be made, and reliques be placed in them;" L. 11, Epist. 76. This is an unanswerable proof, that the English received the use of holy water together with their Christianity.

But it may yet be traced much higher: for in the reign of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, when the Jews by magical enchantments hindered the building of a church, we have in St. Epiphanius this blessing of water

used effectually by the holy count Joseph; who, after he had made the sign of the cross upon it, prayed thus: "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, may this water have power against the magical charms and enchantments they have used; and may it restore to the fire its natural force, that the house of God may be finished."

We have the like instance, in Theodoret, of water blessed with the sign of the cross, and no less effectually used, by St. Marcellus, bishop of Apamea, against the devil hindering a temple of the heathens from taking fire. For the blessed water was no sooner thrown upon it, but the charm was dissolved. L. 5, Hist. Eccl. c. 21.

St. Jerom also relates, that one Italicus, a Christian officer of Gaza, who by his place was to entertain the people with the games called circenses, but had his horses enchanted by his adversary a heathen, had some water given him by St. Hilarian, with which he sprinkled his horses, his chariot, and the barriers, from whence they used to run, and that the charm of witchcraft ceased upon the sprinkling this water. So that the people

cried out, Marnas is overcome by Christ, and many heathens were converted upon it. Hier. in vita Hil. p. 323, Paris edition.

As to the other blessing, first, St. Paul tells us, "that every creature is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." And it is the practice of all Christian churches to bless the meat upon the table. An old Greek ritual, under the name of apostolic constitutions, has a blessing of water and oil, that they may "cure diseases, cast out devils, and preserve from all dangers;" L. 8, c. 29. And does not the Church of England bless or consecrate her churches before any public service is performed in them? We have an instance of this in the consecration of the church of Greenwich. Does she not likewise bless the font in her administration of public baptism? For I find this form of blessing used by the minister, "Almighty and everlasting God, regard, we beseech thee, the supplication of thy congregation: sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin," &c.

But the ceremony of the king's coronation is the most remarkable instance of the Church of England's judgment and approbation of

the blessings of creatures. The history of the coronation of King James the Second, tells us, p. 91, in the margin, that the oil with which he was anointed, was solemnly consecrated in the morning of the coronation by the Dean of Westminster, assisted by the prebendaries. And Baker, in the Life of King Charles the Second, specifies the very form of blessing the royal ornaments, thus: "O God, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, by whom kings do reign and lawgivers make good laws, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, in thy favour to bless this royal ornament—vouchsafe to bless and sanctify this sword, which is hallowed for the defence of thy holy church—God, the 'crown of the faithful,' bless and sanctify this crown, so this thy servant that weareth it be filled with thy manifold graces—bless and sanctify this ring." Printed, London, An. 1696, pp. 742, 744. There is also salt mixed (after being first blessed) with the water. You are the salt of the earth. Matt. v. 13. Salt seasons and preserves: it is also an emblem of wisdom. Salt has been used for the benefit of God's people. "And the men of the city said to Eliseus: Behold,

the situation of this city is very good, as thou my lord seest; but the waters are very bad, and the ground barren. And he said, bring me a new vessel, and put salt into it. And when they had brought it, he went out to the spring of the waters, and cast the salt into it, and said: thus saith the Lord, I have healed these waters; and there shall be no more in them death or barrenness. And the waters were healed unto this day, according to the word of Eliseus, which he spoke." iv. ii. 19, 20, 21, 22. The very name holy water is found in the holy scripture, Num. v. 17, "And he shall take holy water," &c. It is certain that the use of holy water is from the age of the apostles themselves, and that no beginning can be assigned to its use subsequent to their time. The Catholic is the best authority we can look for here below, because it is divine.

CHAPTER XX.

CONFIRMATION.

The scripture for this sacrament. First, 2 Cor. i. 21, 22: And he that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us is God, who also hath sealed us, (with the spiritual character,) and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts. Secondly, Acts viii. 14, 15, 16: Where Philip, the deacon, had converted the city of Samaria to the faith, the apostles who were at Jerusalem sent two bishops, St. Peter and St. John, to confirm them; who, when they were come (saith the text) prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for he was not yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus; then did they impose their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, Acts xix. 5, 6: Where we read that St. Paul baptized and confirmed about twelve of St. John's disciples: "Hearing these things, they were baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus; and when St. Paul

had imposed hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." The principal and proper effect of it is the interior unction of the Holy Ghost, which makes us perfect Christians, and able to profess our faith before persecuting tyrants. The council of Laodicea, Can. 48, says, that those that have been baptized, must, after baptism, receive the most holy chrism, and be made partakers of the heavenly kingdom. St. Jerom, in his epistles against the Luciferians: "Dost thou not know also (saith he) that this is the custom of the churches, that hands should be imposed on such as have been baptized, and so the Holy Ghost be invoked? Dost thou require to know where it is written? In the Acts of the Apostles, and though there were no authority of scripture for it, yet the consent of the whole world in this behalf would be equal to a precept; for many other things also which are observed in the churches by tradition, do claim unto themselves the authority of a written law." You see, he owns it to be commanded in the scripture; and though it were not so, yet to be equal to a precept, and have the authority of a written law, because it is apostolical tradi-

tion that such as have been baptized must also be confirmed. "Is there any man," saith he, "of so perverse a heart as to deny these children on whom we impose hands, to have received the Holy Ghost, because they speak not with tongues?" St. Augustin, Trac. 6. in Epist. on Joan. And he further observes: "The sacrament of chrism, like visible seals, is sacred and holy, even as baptism itself." Aug. Lib. 2. cont. lit. Pet. c. 104. From all these authorities we evidently see that prayer and the laying on their hands were the outward means used by the apostles, by which the Holy Ghost was communicated to their souls; prayer, as a preparation, and laying on their hands, as the immediate means appointed for that great gift of God

CHAPTER XXI.

BAPTISM.

By baptism we are born again, or created anew in Christ Jesus, and therefore before it we are not capable of receiving any other. Christ expressed the form of baptism, and gave us a command to baptize. St. Matt. xxviii. 29: Go, therefore, (saith he) teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. St. John iii. 5: Unless a man be born again, of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The matter of baptism is natural, only; for artificial water will not suffice. It makes us the children of God, and remits both original and actual sin, if he that is baptized be guilty of it. It infuseth justifying grace into the soul, with habits of faith, hope and charity, and all supernatural gifts and virtues, as is proved out of Gal. iii. 27: As many of you as are baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. Secondly, out of 1 Cor. vi. 10, 11, where,

speaking of fornicators, idolators, thieves, adulterers and liars: These things (saith St. Paul) ye were, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of God. Thirdly, out of Tit. v. 6, 7: He hath saved us by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath abundantly poured out upon us, by Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we may be heirs according to the hope of life everlasting. Ananias said to Paul, Acts xxii. 16: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." St. Peter said thus to the Jews: "Be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Acts ii. 38. Let no man trust himself to live without this holy sacrament, which Christ has urgently commanded.

CHAPTER XXII.

MATRIMONY.

MATRIMONY was first ordained in Paradise by Almighty God, when he gave Eve as wife to Adam, who presently said, "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh." Gen. ii. 22, 24. Christ declared the indissolubility of marriage, saying, "Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh; that, therefore, which God hath joined together, let no man separate." Matt. xix. 6. Marriage is a sacrament, as we prove out of Eph. v. 31, 32: They shall be two in one flesh; this is a great sacrament. But I speak in Christ, and in the church.

CHAPTER XXIII.

EXTREME UNCTION.

St. James v. 13, 14, 15: Is any man sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of our Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and our Lord will raise him up, and if he be in sin his sins shall be forgiven him. It comforts the soul in her last agony against despair and all the temptations of our enemy, and helps us to die well. The Reformation gentlemen, to avoid the trouble of attending every sick person, did not retain that holy practice, although St. James taught it.

CHAPTER XXIV.

WORSHIP AND INVOCATION OF ANGELS AND SAINTS.

And when Josue was in the field of the city of Jericho, he lifted up his eyes, and saw a man standing over against him, holding a drawn sword; and he went to him, and said: Art thou one of ours, or of our adversaries? And he answered: No, but I am prince of the host of the Lord: and now I am come. Josue fell on his face to the ground. And worshipping, said: What saith my lord to his servant? Loose, saith he, thy shoes from thy feet: for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Josue did as was commanded him. Josue v. 13, 14, 15, 16. This worshipping was not with divine honour, but with a religious veneration of an inferior kind, suitable to the dignity of his person. This kind of worship is given, even to those who are eminent for sanctity, in this world; for Abdias, governor of the house of Achab, king of Israel, meeting with poor Elias the prophet, "When he knew him, he fell on his face, and said,

Art thou my lord Elias?" 1 Kings xviii. 7; and "the children of the prophets seeing Eliseus, said the spirit of Elias hath rested upon Eliseus, and coming to meet him, they worshipped him falling to the ground," 2 Kings ii. 15. "And after I had heard and seen, I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things." Rev. xxii. 8.

Christ says, (Luke xv. 7, 10,) "There shall be joy in heaven before the angels of God, upon one sinner doing penance." The angels know what happens here on earth whenever it is the will of God that they should know, and the laws by which they are informed, are quite different from the manner by which we know the things that come to pass. "And an angel of God called to Agar, from heaven, saying, What art thou doing, Agar? Fear not, for God hath heard the voice of the boy." Gen. xxi. 7: "And an angel of the Lord from heaven called to him, saying, Abraham, Abraham, lay not thy hand upon the boy," &c. Gen. xxii. 11, 12: "The angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jeru-

salem, and the cities of Juda, with which thou hast been angry? This is now the seventieth year." Zach. i. 12: "When thou didst pray with tears, and didst bury the dead by night, I offered thy prayer to the Lord," (saith the angel Raphael to Tobias, Tob. xii. 12.) Abraham could tell the rich man, that "his five brothers had Moses and the prophets;" Luke xvi. 29. Did not Moses and the prophets live many years after Abraham was dead? We read in the second book of Chron. xxi. 12, that Elias had sent a letter to Joram, telling him of many particular wicked actions, which he had committed after Elias was translated: Elias, therefore, being departed, knew what passed in the world, and showed his great care to assist his brethren in this life, his own departure happened the eighteenth year of king Josaphat's reign, (2 Kings ii. 11,) and Josaphat reigned five and twenty years, as is manifest; 2 Chron. xx. 31. So that seven years of Josaphat's reign elapsed after the departure of Elias; then this Joram's son reigned after Josaphat, 2 Chron. xxi. 1, and it was to him that this letter came from Elias.

We have several examples taken from scripture, how saints living even in this world, could know and tell many things which were secretly done by others; for Samuel said thus to Saul, "I will tell thee all that is in thy heart," 1 Samuel ix. 19; and Eliseus told Giezi what he had committed privately, 2 Kings v. 26. The same Eliseus knew also what was said in the king of Syria's private chamber, 2 Kings vi. 12; and St. Peter knew the deceitful heart of Ananias, and said unto him, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart?" Acts v. 4. By which you see that some saints even in this world, and other saints after their departure from it, knew their brethren's actions.

The scripture says, (Hos. xii. 4,) that "Jacob wept, and made supplication to the angel;" Gen. xlviii. 15, &c., that he first called upon God, and afterwards upon his good angel, in order to help and bless the children of Joseph; and he declares, that this angel delivered him from several evils. Another example from Zacharias, which affirms, that the angel made supplication to the Lord, beseeching him to have mercy on Jerusalem,

and on the cities of Juda; and the prophet says, in that chapter, v. 13, "that the Lord answered the angel, with good and comfortable words." Daniel tells you what assistance Michael the angel had given to himself, "None," saith he, "is my helper in these things, but Michael your prince," Dan. x. 21, and also says thus: "At that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince, who standeth for the children of thy people;" Dan. xii. 1. St. John says, "I saw the angels standing in the presence of God, and to them were given seven trumpets, and another angel came and stood before the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer the prayers of all the saints, upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God, and the smoke of the incense from the hand of the angel is the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God." Rev. viii. 2, &c.

The scripture says, (Exod. xxxii. 12, 13,) that "Moses spoke to the Lord, saying: Let thy anger cease, and be appeased upon the wickedness of thy people. Remember, Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy servants." And the

next verse says, "The Lord was appeased from doing the evil which he had spoken against his people." Would not Solomon's kingdom be given to his own servants, if it had not been for the sake of David, then dead? 1 Kings xi. 11, 12. Was it not also on account of David's merit, then dead, Abias obtained that, his son Asa reigned in Jerusalem? As you may see in the same book, xv. 4. And would not the city of Jerusalem have been destroyed by the Assyrians, were it not on account of David's good works; 2 Kings xix. 32, &c.; xx. 6. "Then said the Lord to me, if Moses and Samuel shall stand before me, my soul is not towards this people," Jer. xv. 1. It evidently appears by this expression, that Moses and Samuel, (then dead,) were accustomed, after their death, to intercede for these people, and that their intercession was most powerful and acceptable before God; you have such another text, in Ezek. xiv. 17, &c. And Elephaz, seeing holy Job's great affliction, said thus to him: "Call now, if there be any that will answer thee, and turn to some of the saints;" Job. v. 1. Does not this mode of expression clearly show that Job

used to ask the assistance of saints that were dead.

Judas Machabeus, (2 Mach. xv. 12, 13, &c.) tells us thus, that he saw (in an admirable vision) Onias the high priest, and Jeremiah the prophet, (long after their death,) earnestly interceding with God for the people of Israel. "And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints," Rev. v. 8. "All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do," Exod. xix. 8. "Moses told the words of the people to the Lord," which words were well known to God before Moses had mentioned them; yet by mentioning them he made (by his joint mediation) this cheerful offer of the people more pleasing to God; and because he did this to their great advantage, Moses tells them again: "I stood between the Lord and you at that time;" Deut. v. 5. You may see another example of this kind of mediation, in the book of Job, where God spoke thus to Job's three friends,

"My wrath is kindled against thee, take therefore unto you seven oxen and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer for yourselves a holocaust, and my servant Job shall pray for you, his face I will accept," Job xlii. 7, &c. "Brethren, (says St. Paul,) pray for us," 1 Thes. v. 25. He bids also the Hebrews "pray for him," Heb. xiii. 18, and says thus to the Romans, "I beseech you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you assist me in your prayers for me to God." Rom. xv. 30.

"I do not deny, (says Bishop Montague,) but the saints are mediators, as they call them, of prayer and intercession. They interpose with God by their supplications, and mediate by prayer," in Antid. p. 20. And again, in his treatise of Invocation, p. 118, he writes thus: I own Christ is not wronged in his mediation: it is no impiety to say, (as Papists do,) Holy Mary, pray for us. The saints shall be as the angels of God. Matt. xxii. 30. Let those who pretend that the saints and angels cannot know what passes upon earth, tell us how the dead will hear the last trumpet

when the Archangel shall sound it? for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise again. The power of God is above any thing we can conceive, and he can confer upon his saints attributes of which we have no conception.

CHAPTER XXV.

OF IMAGES.

THE Scripture says, (Numb. xxi. 8,) "The Lord said unto Moses, make thee a fiery serpent, and set it up, and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and set it, and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any, when he beheld the serpent of brass he recovered." The serpent was a type and figure of Christ exalted upon the cross. John iii. 14. The council of Trent declares thus, Due honour and veneration is to be given to the images of Christ, of the mother of God, and of the saints. The Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, (Exod. xxv. 18, &c.,) "Thou shalt make two cherubims of gold of beaten work, thou shalt make them in the two ends of the mercy seat, and make one cherubim on the one end, and the other cherubim on the other end, and the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another, towards the

mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be." And hence St. Paul says, thus: "There was a tabernacle, and over it were the cherubims of glory, shadowing the mercy seat." Heb. ix. 2, &c. And when this tabernacle was placed in the temple of God, the temple itself had cherubims graven on the walls, as is evident from the second book of Chronicles, iii. 19, &c., where it is said, that, "In the holy house he made two cherubims of image work, and overlaid them with gold, and their faces were towards the house; he made the veil of blue and purple crimson, and wrought in cherubims. And all the people kneeled immediately before these pictures, and adored towards them, when they prayed in the temple;" whereby you may perceive how impiously they went to work in the beginning of the reformation, by throwing all images out of the churches; whereas you see now, by clear scripture, that God himself gave a command for making and placing them in his holy temple.

But you will say that the use of images is contrary to this commandment, "Thou shalt not make to thee a graven thing, nor any

similitude," Exod. xx. 4, to which I answer, that the text speaks of idols, which are worshipped as gods; and you may see from the very next verse, which speaks thus of the things that are here prohibited: "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." We pay no such worship to images, which we hold to be wholly incapable of being served by us in the manner the idols were served by the Gentiles in former times. Indeed, if God had forbidden, by this text, the use of images, he would not immediately after in the same book, xxv. 18, &c., commanded Moses to make the images of the cherubims to be placed in the ark, before whose presence idols could not stand, as we see by Dagon, (1 Sam. v. 3, &c.,) so often cast down before it: neither would Solomon place images round about the walls of God's temple, (2 Chron. iii. 7,) so that it manifestly appears how falsely some preachers apply what is spoken in Scripture against idols, to the images of angels, Christ, and his saints: they also falsely translated this text, and this purposely, that they might make the ignorant people believe that we are idolators. The truth of this is also

evident, for the Septuagint, which they pretend to follow, hath the word Eidolon, that is, idols, and the Hebrew hath the word פֶּסֶל which word only signifies a graven thing or idol. So you may perceive that the whole import of the commandment is directed against idols, and not against images or pictures. Bear in mind, that in the ages of true faith there were many images of gold and silver. The reformers wished to get their godly hands upon them, but they feared the people; they therefore sent out preachers, or rather lecturers, to cry down the use of images, pretending they were against the command of God. The churches therefore were plundered, and the plunderers paid the preachers well out of the gold and silver taken from the churches. This is one of the greatest reasons they had at first for preaching against images. They got the gold and silver, and their families are rich to this day, and little do the people of our times reflect upon the motives their forefathers had for preaching against images. Let them now reflect at last. The second Nicene council defined, that the sacred images of Christ and his saints are to be had and kept

in churches, and that salutation or inferior honour may be given them, but not Latria, or sovereign honour which belongs to God only. Act 7, An. Dom. 431.

CHAPTER XXVI.

OF THE RELICS OF SAINTS, AND PILGRIMAGES TO HOLY PLACES.

The Scripture says, (2 Kings xiii. 21,) "And it came to pass as they were burying a man—and they cast him into the sepulchre of Eliseus, and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Eliseus, he revived and stood upon his feet." You see also, c. ii. 13, 14, &c., how miraculously God honoured the mantle of Elias, upon which Eliseus passed over the river Jordan: what wonder is it, then, that the bones and garments of other saints should be likewise dignified with such miracles? The devout woman said, "If I but touch his garment I shall be whole; and Jesus turning about, and seeing her, said, thy faith hath made thee whole." Mat. ix. 21, 22. Behold how the cure was wrought by the exterior touch, accompanied with interior faith. "The whole multitude sought to touch him, for virtue came out of him, and cured all," Luke vi. 19. "God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul,

so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the wicked spirits went out of them," Acts xix. 11, 12. We read that the primitive Christians had a great veneration even for St. Peter's shadow, and God confirmed their devotion by many miracles, as is evident from the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said, "that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them in beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed every one," Acts v. 15, 16.

The scripture says, (Gen. xlvi. 1,) "That Israel took journey with all that he had, and came to Beersheba, and offered sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac." Protestants pretend that God is not more accessible in one place, than he is in another, as their catechism affirms, page 39. But do they imagine that people of sense or learning will prefer this imaginary notion to that which the

word of God most clearly declares? or do they think that their ministers are more holy or wise in this respect than the patriarch Jacob, who the scripture tells you, practised the contrary of what they make their people believe? You might have some manner of pretence to give credit to them, if their assertion had been confirmed by some heavenly vision. Jacob's devotion was at the aforesaid well, as may be seen by the second verse of this chapter; nay, we read (Gen. xxvi. 23, &c.) that his father Isaac, was also honoured with a heavenly vision, while performing his devotions at the same well, of which you may read more, Gen. xxi. · And if God be no more accessible in one place than he is in another, why doth the scripture say: "Ye shall not do so unto the Lord, but unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of your tribes, to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither shall ye come, thither shall ye bring your burnt offerings and sacrifices." Deut. xi. 4, &c. And hence it is said of God, "that thy eyes may be open upon this house, night and day upon this place, whereof thou hast

said, that thou wouldst put thy name to hearken to the prayers which thy servant prayeth towards this place, hearken therefore unto the supplication of thy servant, and of thy people made towards this place," 2 Chron. vi. 120, &c. And in the ensuing verses, there are many blessings solicited for those who would pray in that holy place, wherefore people undertook to go thither in pilgrimage, though they were obliged by the law to go there thrice every year, as the word of God declares, saying, "three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord," Ex. xxiii. 17. And because Daniel (in his captivity) could not go to perform his devotion there, the windows of his chamber being towards Jerusalem, "he kneeled upon his knees thrice a day, and prayed, and gave thanks to his God, as he did aforetime," Dan. vi. 10. You may take notice also of what the angel told Moses, Acts vii. 23, and to Joshua, v. 15, for he told them, "that the places whereon they stood were holy ground;" but if the transitory presence of those angels so sanctified the ground upon which they stood for a short time, how can you deny that

the permanent abode of the bodies of the saints doth not likewise sanctify the place wherein they are preserved, and in which they shed their blood, by suffering martyrdom for Jesus Christ? Do you not see by scripture, (2 Kings v. 14,) that Naaman the Assyrian, was cleansed from his leprosy by washing himself seven times in the river Jordan, and that after his cure, he besought Eliseus, (v. 17,) to permit him to carry with him two mules burden of earth from the Holy Land, that hereafter he might offer sacrifice to God upon that earth in his own country, because he could not (by reason of the great journey) come to Jerusalem to perform his devotion; you see also by scripture that there were "certain Greeks, who came to Jerusalem to worship at the feast." (John xii. 20,) yet those people were not obliged to the observance of the Jewish laws, and notwithstanding this, their devotion prompted them to undergo the hardships of that pilgrimage; and it happened very fortunately to the eunuch that came from Ethiopia, to perform his devotion there, for at his returning home, the angel of the Lord came to Philip, and desired him to meet

this eunuch, which he did, and hereby the eunuch believed in Christ, and was immediately baptized by him, Acts viii. 26, &c. You see likewise in scripture, that memorable passage of St. John, which says: "There is in Jerusalem, by the sheep-market, a pool having five porches, and in these were a great multitude of persons, blind, lame, withered, expecting the stirring of the water, and an angel of the Lord descended at a certain time into the pond, and the water was stirred, and he that had gone down first into the pond, after the stirring of the water, was made whole of what infirmity soever." John v. 2, &c. Here let it be well understood that the faithful are left at perfect liberty to visit such places or not, just as they felt inclined. There is no doubt but many pious persons after having read the Holy Scriptures would be desirous of seeing the holy places where the Lord of Glory stood, and above all, the place where the author of life laid down his own for our salvation. What would be your feelings were you to visit those holy places? Your heart would melt with divine love when you would ask mercy of him who died for you on that spot.

CHAPTER XXVII.

GOOD WORKS.

Christ said to Mary Magdalene, (Mark xiv. 6,) "She hath wrought a good work on me." Christ said to the young man, "If you will be perfect, go and sell all you have and give it to the poor," (Matt. xix. 21.) St. Paul says again, (Colos. i. 24,) "I who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is wanting of the afflictions of Christ, in my flesh, for his body's sake, which is the church." And if you would take the pains to read our books, you might clearly see by them, that we believe, that the passion of Christ, in itself is of a sufficient value, to satisfy for all the sins of the whole world, yea of millions of worlds, and also for all the pains that are, or can be due to these sins; yet we say, and this according to scripture, that Christ, by his unsearchable wisdom, knew it was fit to order it so, that the full fruit of his passion should not be applied to any but to those who could perform several things, which

he requires at their hands for this effect; not that there is need of this to supply any want or value which might be in his passion; but that there is need to do these things on our parts, by virtue of the covenant and condition upon which the benefit of Christ's passion is granted unto us. Although Christ died for us, yet we must repent and be baptized and fulfil all justice.

Daniel (iv. 27) said to Nebuchadnezzar, "O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and redeem thy sins with alms, and thy iniquity with mercy to the poor." Tobias says, "That alms deliver from death, and purge all sins," Tob. xii. 9. And "That alms deliver from death, and suffereth not to go into darkness," Tob. iv. 10. And hence Ecclesiasticus says, "That as water quencheth burning fire, so alms expiate sin." Eccles. iii. 33. Solomon says, "That by mercy and truth, sin shall be forgiven, and by the fear of the Lord, men depart from evil." Prov. xvi. 6. And Christ says thus, "But rather give alms of all things such as you have, and behold all things are clean unto you."

Luke xi. 41. Therefore he exhorts us to the secret performance of our fasts, alms-deeds, and prayers, and he tells us, that "Otherwise we will lose our reward; but if we do them in secret, our father, which seeth in secret, will reward us openly;" "lay up for yourselves," saith he, "treasure in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." Matt. vi. 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, &c. "Whosoever shall give to one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, Amen, I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." Matt. x. 42. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every one according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27. "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you. For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger, and you took me in, naked, and ye clothed me. I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me." Matt. xxv. 34, &c. "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the weak,

the lame and blind, and thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke xiv. 13, 14. For this reason, St. Paul calls alms-deeds, the seed of glory, saying thus of it: "But this I say, he who soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly, and he who soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully, every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him not give grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver, and God is able to make all grace abound towards you, that you always having all sufficiency in all things may abound to every good work." 2 Cor. ix. 6, &c. He encourages likewise the Philippians to give alms, and to do other good works, that thereby they might merit; for he says thus to them, "In Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity; not because I desire a gift, but I desire fruit that may abound to your account. I have received of Epaphroditus, the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a acrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God, but my God shall supply all your need, according to his riches in glory by Jesus Christ." Phil. vi. 16. And commanded the Bishop Timothy,

"To charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves, a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life," 1 Tim. vi. 17, &c. David says thus, "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me." Psalm xviii. 20. And hence it is said, that "God is justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness." 1 Kings viii. 32. "Be you strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak, for your work shall be rewarded. 2 Cor. xv. 7. "They who have done good things shall go forth in the resurrection of life. John v. 29. "Be glad and rejoice, for great is your reward in heaven." Matt. v. 12. And when Peter said thus unto Christ, "Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee, what shall we have therefore?" Matt. xix. 27. Christ made them a promise because they followed him, "That when he would sit upon the throne of his glory, that

they also would sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," v. 28. And hence St. Paul says, that "Every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour." 1 Cor. iii. 8. And that "our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us an eternal weight of glory." 2 Cor. iv. 17. "For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; for he that soweth in his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth in the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting; and let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season, we shall reap if we faint not; as we have therefore opportunity let us do good unto all men, knowing, that every one what good soever he shall do, that shall he receive of the Lord." Gal. vi. 7, &c. Which to confirm, he brings in the example of Moses, "who refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to be afflicted with the people of God, esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompence of reward." Heb. xi. 24, &c. And he also says thus of himself, "I have

fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the just judge, shall give at that day, and not to me only, but also unto all them that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 7. "Now to him that worketh is the reward, not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Rom. iv. 4. Christ therefore, will say in the day of judgment, these words of St. John: "My reward is with me, to give every one according as his works shall be." Rev. xxii. 12. Do you see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. St. James ii. 24.

THE END.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Jan. 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BX1751

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 288 757 0